DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 518 EA 009 983

AUTHOR Reed, Rodney J.
TITLE School Principals: Leaders or Managers?
PUB DATE 16 Jul 77
NOTE 200p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$10.03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Education; *Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; *Occupational Information; *Principals; Questionnaires; Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

The overall objective of this study of 43 elementary and secondary principals is to provide greater insight into the nature of the principalship and into the characteristics of principals and their schools. More specifically, the objectives are to determine whether the study of the principalship and of principals by school level or location should be continued; to provide a conceptual framework for examining the tasks of the principal; to examine perceptions of principals regarding preparation programs; to examine the efforts and the influence of principals in bringing about change in the schools; to examine patterns of career aspirations of principals; and to examine the job satisfaction of principals. The conceptual framework used in examining the tasks of the principal included consideration of school management, educational leadership, teacher and staff personnel, student personnel, and parent and community relations. The typical principal in this study is concerned more with educational leadership than with school management. A bibliography and the survey questionnaire are included. (Author/IRT)t

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED145518

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

School Principals: Leaders or Managers?

Rodney J. Reed

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rodney J. Reed

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

EA 009 983

Copyright

by

Rodney J. Reed

July 16, 1977

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to the principals who gave of their time to respond to the questionnaire. Without their participation this study would not have been possible.

To the review panel of principals, district administrators and professors who assisted in helping to sharpen the focus of the study and who critiqued various drafts of the questionnaire, my sincere thanks. The members of that panel were: Robert E. Shogren, Dr. Nels B. Nelson, Dr. William Tibbey, Mrs. Katherine Watson, George Benson, Dr. Harry Reynolds, Dr. Philip Lum, Leo Gaspardone, Ms. Mary Logan, Prof. Edgar L. Morphet, Prof. Theodore L. Reller, Dr. John Matlin, Dr. Herbert E. Salinger, Dr. Elaine Boyce, Dr. Ann Freers, Charles Cadman, Greg Hearn, Willie Adkins, William Gonsalves and John Hayman.

Christopher Wright assisted in processing the data and with the preliminary analysis. To him I am very thankful.

Finally, to Eileen Kane, and Debbie White, who typed various sections of this study, to Maria Van Vianen, who, in addition to typing sections of the report, assisted with the mailing of questionnaires and follow-up letters, and to Viviane Dutoit, who typed the final manuscript, my most heartfelt thanks.

Rodney J. Reed

7/7/77

CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	iii
Chapter	
I. Introduction	1
Objectives	3
Procedures	
Sample	4
Data Collection and Analysis	6
Organization of Study	7
II. Conceptualizing the Job of the Principal	
Previous Conceptualizations	
Administrative Process	8
Task of the Principal	11
Toward a New Conceptualization of the Principal's Task	16
III. Findings	
Principal Characteristics	
Demographic	26
Educational Background	29
Pre-Service Course Usefulness	33
In-Service Education	41
Credentials Held	43
Experience Background	47

CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
	School Characteristics	
	Grade Organizational Patterns	54
	Student Family Income	54
	Size of Teaching Staff	54
	Size of Non-Teaching Staff	54
	Student Enrollment and Ethnicity	61
	School Program/Organizational Arrangements	65
	The Task of the Principal	70
	Other Characteristics of Principals	
	Career Aspirations	76
	Job Satisfaction	81
	Influence in School Decisions	85
	Kinds of Changes Implemented in Schools	85
	Financial Compensation	88
IV.	Summary and Implications	91
	Concluding Remarks	112
	Footnotes	116
	Bibliography	121
	Appendices	
	Appendix A	
	Covering Letter	125
	Questionnaire	128

CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Appendix B

Table B1, Actual and Desired Time Principals Devote to Duties and Responsibilities 151

Table B2, School Changes Implemented During Past Three Years 160

Table B3, Help Received from Pre- and In-service Training for Implementing School Change 165

Table B4, Pre-service Preparation Course Usefulness by School Level and Location 166

Table B5, Type and Usefulness of In-service Programs 169

Chapter I

School Principals: Leaders or Managers?

Introduction

The principals of today's schools are faced with a profusion of problems and responsibilities unprecedented in school administration. They are called upon to manage their schools, supervise and evaluate school personnel, provide instructional leadership, build school-community relationships, mediate student, teacher, or parental conflicts, build and maintain staff morale, instigate change, arrange and participate in numerous school, district or community-related meetings, and create and sustain a supportive school environment in which effective teaching and learning can occur. The task of the school principal has become challenging and demanding.

The present complexity of the principalship springs from a mid-19th century concept which viewed principals as teachers who also performed routine school administrative tasks.[1] Gradually, the administrative demands increased, thereby necessitating the full attention of an administrator. Thus, the principal became the manager and instructional leader of the school.[2] Increases in school size, greater societal demands on the school, an expanded role of federal and state agencies in educational programs, the thrust of school accountability, the rise of teacher organizations and teacher negotiations, and the establishment and reinforcement of student and parental rights by legislative and judicial decree have made the principalship considerably more complex.

In spite of this increased complexity, the traditional one principal-per-school concept persists. It may well be, however, that this concept is no longer a realistic one. We must begin to question whether principals can

adequately meet the demands of their positions. Do principals have sufficient time to perform the duties and responsibilities of the principalship in an exemplary manner, or at even a minimum level of adequacy? Are principals being sufficiently prepared to meet the challenge they must face?

On another level, is it justifiable to assume that the principalship differs by school grade level? For example, textbook literature and studies concerning the principal usually focus on elementary, intermediate or senior high schools. But are the duties and responsibilities of principals sufficiently distinct by school grade level to justify the continuing fragmented approach to the study and conceptualization of the principalship? If so, should preparation programs for principals be organized by school level?

Perhaps a more useful approach to the study of the principalship is that based on school geographical location--urban, suburban or rural. For example, the dynamics and characteristics of an urban inner city school may require a different level of sensitivity, awareness, and instructional leadership than those of a suburban middle class school. To the extent that school location is a useful distinction, preparation programs for principals should provide differentiated experiences that will enhance the probability of the principals' effectiveness.

Yet another aspect: if principalships differ by school location or level, do principals themselves engage in a self-selection process? Do they select schools for which their personal, educational or experiential characteristics are unique? Do principals' characteristics differ by school type, thus providing an additional slant on the nature of the principalship?

Questions like the above provide a focus for the study of the dimensions of the principalship in changing school environments.

Objectives

The overall objective of this study is: to provide greater insight into the nature of the principalship, and into the characteristics of principals and their schools. More specifically, the objectives of the study are:

- to determine whether the study of the principalship and principals by school level or location should be continued;
- to provide a conceptual framework for examining the tasks of the principal;
- to examine perceptions of principals regarding preparation programs;
- to examine the efforts and the influence of principals in bringing about change in the school;
- to examine patterns of career aspirations of principals;
- to examine the job satisfaction of principals.

The research questions which evolve from these objectives are:

1. What are the personal, educational, and experiential characteristics of principals, based on school location and school level? Are these characteristics consistent with those reported in previous studies?
2. What are the characteristics of schools in which principals serve, based on school level and location?
3. What is the task of the principal? To what extent do tasks vary by school level and location?
4. What are the career aspirations of principals? Do they vary by school level and location?
5. Are principals satisfied in their jobs? Do variations exist because of school level and location?

6. How much influence do principals have in affecting major administrative decisions in their schools? Does the amount of influence vary by school level and location?

7. Is the principal a change agent? Have pre- and in-service preparation programs helped him to institute change?

8. How do principals view the usefulness of formal pre-service university courses for the principalship?

9. How do principals view the usefulness of in-service programs?

10. What resources do principals feel would help them to be more effective?

Procedures

Sample

The population of schools from which the sample was drawn consisted of 941 public schools in unified school districts (K-12) within a radius of 60 miles of Berkeley, California. From that population, 10% of the elementary schools, 15% of the intermediate schools, and 20% of the senior high schools were randomly selected, for a total of 114 schools. Sample schools were classified by location--urban, suburban, rural--using population census data and estimating geographical distances. Operationally, urban schools were located in population centers of above 60,000, suburban schools in communities adjacent to urban centers with populations between 10,000 and 60,000, and rural schools in population areas of less than 10,000 and at least 25 miles away from urban centers. The distribution of the sample by school level--elementary, intermediate, and senior high--and by school location--urban, suburban, and rural--is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Sample Distribution by School Level and Location

School Location	School Level			Totals
	Elementary	Intermediate	Senior High	
Urban	32 (50%)	15 (50%)	7 (35%)	54 (47%)*
Suburban	29 (45%)	13 (43%)	11 (55%)	53 (46%)
Rural	3 (5%)	2 (7%)	2 (10%)	7 (6%)
Totals	64 (56%)	30 (26%)	20 (18%)	114 (100%)

*Margin percentages are based on the total N of 114.
Column percentages are based on the column totals.

Responses were received from 43 principals for a return rate of 38%. The responding sample consisted of 22 elementary principals (51%), 12 intermediate principals (28%) and 9 senior high principals (21%). The distribution of the responding sample by school level and location is displayed in Table 2.

Table 2

Distribution of Respondents by School Level and Location

School Location	School Level			Total
	Elementary	Intermediate	Senior High	
Urban	11 (50%)	6 (50%)	3 (33%)	20 (47%)
Suburban	10 (45%)	4 (33%)	4 (44%)	18 (42%)
Rural	1 (5%)	2 (17%)	2 (22%)	5 (12%)
Totals	22 (51%)	12 (28%)	9 (21%)	43 (100%)

By school level, the distribution of the responding sample is relatively close to that of the intended sample. However, by school location, suburban school principals are slightly over-represented when compared to their percentage in the intended sample. Given the nature of the responding sample, as well as the exploratory nature of the study, our ability to generalize from the findings is, of course, restricted. Thus, the findings reported will pertain to the sample only.

Data Collection

Data were collected through the use of a mailed questionnaire designed to gather information concerning school characteristics as well as the following personal characteristics of their principals: personal, educational and experiential backgrounds; their tasks, or actual and desired duties and responsibilities; professionalism; perceptions of the effectiveness of in-service training programs, compensation; influence; changes made in their schools; and, assistance which these principals felt would make them more effective administrators.

The questionnaire was critiqued for clarity and content by a panel of 12 urban, suburban, and rural school principals and eight school district administrators and university professors. Modifications were made to clarify ambiguous items, and to ensure ease of response. The questionnaire was field-tested, and then further refined by eliminating and restructing vague items. The final version consisted of 32 items, including seven open-ended questions; it is displayed, along with the covering letter, in Appendix A, pp. 125-149.

Follow-up letters failed to increase the return rate significantly. No significant differences were observed between early and late respondents.

Organization of Study

Following the development of a conceptual scheme of the task of the principalship, the findings of this study are presented under the following sections: Principal Characteristics; School Characteristics; The Task of the Principal; Other Characteristics--career aspirations, job satisfaction, influence, changes implemented in the schools and usefulness of pre- and in-service training in that regard, and compensation. A summary and implications section concludes the study.

Chapter II

Conceptualizing the Job of the Principal

Previous Conceptualizations

Several attempts have been made to describe the task of the principal in both conceptual and normative dimensions. We shall discuss these in turn.

Administrative Process. Conceptually, the role behavior of principals can be examined in the light of administrative process. One of the earliest administrative theorists to maintain that the elements of management or administrative functions were universal was Henri Fayol. Writing in the first quarter of the century, Fayol held that these elements or functions consisted of planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating and controlling.[3] Expanding on the views of Fayol, Gulick described the administrative process as POSDCORB (Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting, Budgeting).[4] Providing in turn a slight variation on Gulick's theme, Sears perceives the administrative process in education as consisting of planning, organizing, directing, coordinating, and controlling.[5] Teal, on the other hand, maintains that administration includes:

a) defining purposes and objectives
b) developing the broad plan for the structuring of the organization
c) recruiting and organizing an executive staff
d) delegating and allocating authority and responsibility
e) overseeing the genral carrying-forward of delegated activities
f) insuring quantity and quality of performance
g) achieving coordination through committees and conferences
h) stimulating and energizing the entire personnel
i) evaluating the total outcome in relation to purposes
j) looking ahead and forecasting the organization's aims, as well as the ways and means of realizing them.[6]

Litchfield argues that the administrative process can be conceptualized through a series of major and minor propositions, as follows:

First major proposition: the administrative process is a cycle of action which includes the following activities:

A. Decision making
B. Programming
C. Communicating
D. Controlling
E. Reappraising

Minor proposition: Decision making may be rational, deliberative, discretionary, and purposive; or it may be irrational, habitual, obligatory, and random; or any combination thereof. In its rational form, decision making is performed by means of the following activities:

a. definition of the issue
b. analysis of the existing situation
c. calculation and delineation of alternatives
d. deliberation
e. choice

Minor proposition: Decisions become guides to action after they have been interpreted in the form of specific programs.

Minor proposition: The effectiveness of a programmed decision will vary with the extent to which it is communicated to those of whom action is required.

Minor proposition: Action required by a programmed and communicated decision is more nearly assured if standards of performance are established and enforced.

Minor proposition: Decisions are based on facts, assumptions, and values that are subject to change. To retain their validity, decisions must, therefore, be reviewed and revised as rapidly as change occurs.[7]

Litchfield develops four other major and nine minor propositions. For him, the administrative process is basically one of decision making and the implementation of the resultant decisions. Litchfield's formulation is, in large measure, closely related to the theoretical formulations of both Simon[8] and Griffiths,[9] who cogently make the case for administration as decision making.

Ramseyer, et al., maintain that the areas of desirable behavior for educational administrators are:

a. setting goals
b. making policy
c. determining roles
d. appraising
e. working with community leadership to promote improvements in education
f. coordinating administrative functions and structure
g. using educational resources of the community
h. involving people
i. communicating[10]

In each of the foregoing conceptualizations of the administrative process, basic themes are reiterated with slight modifications. Thus, in summarizing these formulations, Gregg maintains that the administrative process fundamentally consists of decision making, planning, organizing, communicating, influencing, coordinating and evaluating.[11] Most general conceptualizations can be fit within that framework.

The Task of the Principal. A description of what principals do or should do, provides a practical view of their tasks. For example, in an attempt to define a competency pattern in educational administration, the Southern State Cooperative Program in Educational Administration identified the following critical task areas for principals:

1. instruction and curriculum development
2. pupil personnel
3. community school leadership
4. staff personnel
5. school plant
6. school transportation
7. organization and structure
8. school finance and business management.[12]

For each task area, several related tasks were developed which more clearly indicate the kinds of activities demanded of the principal. Thus, the critical task area "instruction and curriculum development" includes such related activities as: providing for formulation of curriculum objectives, providing for determination of curriculum content and organization, and providing for supervision of instruction.

From another viewpoint, Hemphill's, Griffiths', and Frederiksen's study of elementary school principals is applicable to the principal's task at all school levels.[13] Using a national sample of 232 elementary school principals, the study created a simulated school situation and elicited from the principals responses to typical school problems (presented in the form of in-basket items). In addition, other psychological and sociological data pertaining to the principalship were collected. The factor analysis of the in-basket test performance of principals and of other variables included in that study revealed eight first-order factors and two second-order factors as major dimensions of principals' performance. These factors were:

First order factors:

Factor A: exchanging information
Factor B: discussing before acting
Factor C: complying with suggestions
Factor D: analyzing the situation
Factor E: maintaining relationships
Factor F: organizing work
Factor G: responding to outsiders
Factor H: directing others

Second order factors:

Factor X: preparation for decision
Factor Y: amount of work[14]

Hemphill, Griffiths, and Fredericksen hold that these factors constitute a taxonomy for the principalship that could be used as a basis for principal preparation programs.

In another study, Gross and Herriott examine the efforts of elementary principals to conform to a role assumption--Executive Professional Leadership (EPL)--that stressed their obligation to improve the performance of teachers. In that study, EPL was an important role behavior for principals, and was positively related to teachers' morale, their professional performance, and to pupils' learning. Examining their data further, Gross and Herriott inferred from the lack of association with EPL that many school systems selected principals on grounds that appeared to have little empirical justification, such as: type or amount of teaching experience, experience as an assistant or vice principal, number of undergraduate and graduate courses in education, number of graduate courses in educational administration, sex, and marital status.[15] This finding corroborates the earlier findings of Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederiksen,[16] and is itself supported by the later findings of Morphet and Schutz,[17] and Anley.[18]

In a study of senior high principals, Hemphill, Richards, and Peterson report that the duties of the principalship are numberous.[19] They state:

> In addition to supervising his instructional staff, the principal typically supervises the work of several non-professional persons such as janitors, cafeteria workers, etc.

> During a typical work week, the principal divides his time among many and diverse activities. Administrative planning, either with superiors or subordinates, meetings with teachers on curriculum or instructional matters, working with individual teachers on their teaching proficiency, meeting with students on disciplinary problems or other matters, meeting with parents, and correspondence, all place heavy demands upon his time. Principals of the smaller high schools frequently have classroom teaching responsibilities also. The pattern of activities appears to relate to school size. Principals of larger schools spend more of their work week with such activities as administrative planning, meetings with teachers with respect to teaching proficiency, meeting with parents, and correspondence, as compared with principals of smaller schools. On the other hand, principals of the smaller schools, in addition to their likelihood of being involved with classroom teaching, are more likely to be involved in supervision of extracurricular activities or perhaps in testing activities. In general, one can characterize the work week of the secondary school principal as one in which he must divide his time among many pressing duties.[20]

In another study concerned with the task of the principal, McPherson, Salley and Baehr developed a Job Functions Inventory to describe key aspects of the principal's job and their importance to job performance. They report that the job of the principal consists of the following.[21]

Relations with people and groups:

- Personal handling of student adjustment problems
- Organizations and extracurricular activities
- Individualized student development
- Utilization of specialized staff
- Evaluation of teacher performance
- Collegial contacts
- Racial and ethnic group problems
- Trouble-shooting and problem solving
- Community involvement and support
- Dealing with gangs

Curriculum:

- Curriculum development
- Instructional materials

Personnel Administration:

- Staffing
- Working with unions

General Administration:

Working with central office
Safety regulation
Fiscal control

McPherson, Salley and Baehr infer from their data that the circumstances in which many principals find themselves, limits their opportunity to be a change agent. They further infer that, given the complexity of the principalship, some relief should be provided for principals.

On another level, Sause reports the results of a survey which has far-reaching implications concerning the task of the principal, as reflected in the competencies beginning principals should have in New York State.[22] This study surveyed 850 chief and deputy school district administrators, 3,500 members of the Council of Supervisors and Administrators of New York State, 2,500 members of the School Administrators and Supervisors of Nassau and Suffolk counties, and 50 professors and 200 students in Education Administration. While Sause points out that the data probably reflect what is done rather than what should be done, he reports that for beginning principals the following competencies, which are associated with role behavior, are thought to be necessary:

1. Role of personnel leader
   a) evaluating staff
   b) maintaining and promoting good staff morale
2. Role of school manager
3. Role of curriculum leader

Those competencies viewed as unnecessary for the neophyte administrator are:

Role I. Instructional leader
   a) providing appropriate instructional programs for each student
   b) evaluating current instructional programs

Role II. Personnel leader

maintaining appropriate personnel records

Role III. Community leader

a) identifying community needs
b) ascertaining whether school programs meet community needs
c) raising community expectations for educational programs.[23]

The competencies reported by Sause as unnecessary for beginning principals are somewhat unexpected, particularly those for the role of community leader. One might reason that the beginning principal does not have time to engage in community-related activities; or that the experiences with community control in New York City may have contributed to a desire on the part of administrators to avoid community involvement.[24] However, we believe that schools should not exist without regard for the communities they serve. The development of anti-community attitudes thus bears careful scrutiny.

Two final views pertaining to the task of the principal are provided by Downey, and by Lipham and Hoeh. Downey suggests that the tasks of the principal include professional staff development, student growth and development, student activities and government, curriculum development, instructional improvement, utilization of materials of instruction, community relations (attendance areas), and accountability in teaching and learning.[25] Lipham and Hoeh maintain that the primary tasks of principals lie in the areas of instructional program, staff personnel, student personnel, financial and physical resources, and school community resources.[26]

From the foregoing, it is clear that the task of the principal is diverse and demanding. It is equally clear that his task is an ever-changing mosaic. He is required to shift role-behaviors as a result of: negotiated

contracts between teacher unions and school districts; increased participation of community members in school decisions; expanded federal and state roles in special school programs; and external determinations proffered by academicians, special study groups and the like, concerning what duties and responsibilities the principal should meet. It is increasingly important, therefore, to investigate and monitor the duties and responsibilities of principals within the constraints of the demands they currently face. We must seek to understand more fully the nature of the principalship and how it might be better structured to meet school goals and objectives. Thus, in the next section, we formulate a conceptual framework to be used in investigating the extent to which the principal's task now includes role-behaviors that are influenced by conditions such as the above, as well as by those functions thought to be more traditionally associated with their task.

Toward a New Conceptualization of the Principal's Task

The job of the educational administrator has been described both in terms of process and as tasks.

Conceptually, the administrative process is seen as consisting of variations on one or more of the following functions: decision making, planning, organizing, communicating, influencing, coordinating and evaluating.[27] As discussed earlier, conceptualizations of the administrative process have been developed by Gulick, Sears, Teal, Litchfield, Simon, Griffiths, and Ramseyer, et al., among others. The process of educational administration is fundamental to all sound administrative functions. It applies equally to school principals and school superintendents and to every broad educational program.

In contradistinction to the administrative process, which provides a conceptual basis for the functions of administrators, the administrative task refers to what is done or should be done in the job situation--to the duties and responsibilities of the administrator. Thus, the task of educational administration has been described to include aspects associated with instructional and curriculum development, pupil personnel, community school leadership, teaching and staff personnel, school plant, school transportation, school organization and structure, school finance, and business management.[28] From another view, the task of educational administration is believed to include such broad categories as: relating to the community; the improvement of educational opportunity; obtaining, developing, and improving personnel; and providing and maintaining funds and facilities.[29]

As described above, it is apparent that many of the tasks are appropriate to educational administrators at levels above the principal. For example, one of the above task areas, school finance, as it relates to securing funds for operating the schools, is not the direct responsibility of the principal. Nor can providing and maintaining facilities, e.g., a school building, be construed as the principal's direct responsibility. We do not suggest, however, that principals have no voice in these matters. Quite the opposite is true. Within the total educational system, their input into policy decisions is valuable and should be encouraged. Ultimately, however, major policy decisions in school districts (e.g., seeking tax revenue and restructing the curriculum), are made by the school board. These decisions may be, and usually are, made upon the recommendation of the

superintendent. Thus, the areas mentioned above are appropriate tasks for the superintendent and his staff but are, we believe, inappropriate for principals. What, then, is the task of the principal, or what should it be?

From the view of Hemphill, Richards, and Frederiksen, the areas of performance of the elementary school principal should include exchanging information, discussing before acting, complying with suggestions, analyzing the situation, maintaining relationships, organizing work, responding to outsiders, and directing others.[30] As leadership procedures, many of these functions are highly desirable. Principals as well as other key school administrators should endeavor to maintain an open communication system, establish mechanisms for rational decision making, and maintain sound policies for organizing and directing staff work efforts. However, the functions advanced by Hemphill, Richards, and Frederiksen fail to specify the work areas (e.g., school budget, curriculum), over which the principal should maintain control.

Downey, on the other hand, reports that the task of the principal should include the following high priority areas: professional staff development, student growth and development, student activities and government, curriculum development, instructional improvement, utilization of materials of instruction, community relations (attendance areas) and accountability in teaching and learning.[31] Generally, these performance areas begin to indicate the duties and responsibilities (or task) of the principal with more precision. Nevertheless, the extent of a principal's ability to directly perform all of these tasks is questionable. For example, is student growth and development a primary task of the principal or of the

teacher? While it can be argued that administrators at the level of the principal and above should share a major responsibility in providing conducive school environments for teaching and learning, we must recognize that teachers have a more direct responsibility for stimulating, challenging and assisting students in their intellectual growth and development. Both administrative and teacher roles are important. Suggesting that student growth and development is a major responsibility of the principal without recognizing the importance of others in this regard provides a limited view.

Another questionable high-priority task area for the principal proposed by Downey is that of professional staff development. Clearly, the importance of this area cannot be disputed. However, because of lack of time, and often of expertise, the implementation of this task appears to be more appropriate at the school district level, as a task for supervisors, consultants, and other specialists. Moreover, in many school districts, professional staff development is encouraged by financial incentives for additional specified levels of training at colleges and universities. Principals can encourage professional staff development, but frequently cannot provide ample resources for such development.

From another perspective on the task of the principal, McPherson, Salley and Baehr hold that the key duties and responsibilities of principals are indicated in their job function inventory (JFI).[32] Earlier in our discussion, we noted that these researchers characterize the principal's job under the following headings: relations with people and groups; curriculum; personnel administration; and general administration. While the job

dimensions on the JFI are convincing as key duties and responsibilities, it is not at all clear that the sub-categories (such as working with unions, which is associated with personnel administration, and curriculum development, which is linked to curriculum) fall primarily in the sphere of the principals' major responsibilities. Unions, whether teacher or staff, generally negotiate contracts at the school district level. The responsibility of the principal is that of adhering to the conditions of a negotiated contract, particularly as it affects working conditions and procedural matters within the school.

The task of the principal is becoming greatly influenced by collective bargaining. As a result of teacher negotiations or bargaining, the control and influence of the principal in the school setting is being eroded.[33] Teachers are successfully demanding that they be included in policy decisions concerning their role. As a consequence, the traditional role of the principal is being altered by the power and influence teachers wield through collective bargaining.[34] The impact of collective bargaining thus intensifies the necessity of examining anew the task of the principal.

In the matter of curriculum development, many school districts use district curriculum development committees, curriculum coordinators or specialists, and curriculum supervisors. Hence, the responsibility of principals in this area is usually not a major one, although they may serve on curriculum committees and provide input into curriculum decisions. We do not argue that instructional planning and the improvement of curriculum and teaching should not be an important role of the principal, as is suggested by several writers.[35] However, principals often find themselves in situations

in which the press of other duties deters them from concentrating their efforts in the area of curriculum development. Moreover, the existence of curriculum specialists in school districts curtails the necessity of having principals devote considerable effort to the design and improvement of the curriculum.

Viewing the task of the principal rather cautiously, Lipham and Hoeh suggest,as indicated earlier, that several categories of functions account for the major amount of time spent by principals on the job, and also reflect the content of specialized programs in educational administration for the principalship. Based upon these observations, they state that the task of the principal can be divided into the following categories: instructional program; staff personnel; student personnel; financial and physical resources; school community resources.[36]

The results of the study conducted by Hemphill, Richards, and Peterson lead them to conclude that the primary duties of senior high principals are: administrative planning; meetings with teachers; working with teachers; meeting with students; meetings with parents; and correspondence. Additionally, these researchers indicate that principals of smaller high schools may engage in classroom teaching, supervision of extracurricular activities, and testing activities.[37] Clearly, these duties command a considerable amount of time. Whether these duties are equally valid for elementary and intermediate principals is not apparent.

In reviewing several prognoses for the future role of the principal, Mazzarella notes that writers such as Johnson, Logsdon and Wiegman, Peterson, Templeton, Mattaliano, and Barth, all feel that principals will be increasingly called upon to serve as coordinators.[38] The role of coordinator

will be particularly necessary in schools which have team teaching, differentiated staffing, traditional and open classrooms, and in multiunit schools. Principals may also be called upon in the future to make greater use of computers for such things as drill and practice, individualized testing, and problem solving.[39]

The theme of coordination as a future direction for the task of the principal is seen also in some recommendations made by a commission appointed to draft a framework for overhauling education in California's elementary and secondary schools.[40] The Commission's recommendations concerning the administrator's role include coordinating parents, learners, staff, and other interested parties in participatory decision making, and coordinating educational activities for parents and other community members in an effort to increase their level of awareness about, and involvement in, school programs and decisions. Other Commission recommendations concerning the role behavior of administrators include the performance of tasks involving the development of staff and programs to personalize learning, and the development of an aggressive public information system. Clearly, administrators are seen as exerting greater leadership in the school, especially in the areas of coordination and facilitation.

Without minimizing the importance of coordination, facilitation, or computers, the crucial role of the principal remains that of the instructional leader responsible for maintaining a school climate in which effective teaching and learning can take place. The challenge to school systems is that of providing the time and support for such leadership to be exercised; and of ensuring that skills are acquired by principals that will permit them to function as instructional or educational leaders.

The debate concerning what the task of the principal is or should be has been continuous. However, much of the literature cited includes task areas that may not reflect the reality of the principal's authority, time constraints, or expertise. Viewing previous studies and attempts to describe the task of the principal as it is and should be, we find several limitations, as have been indicated. Further, while we may speculate and make informed predictions concerning the future role of the principal, such predictions might better be made with more understanding of what the present tasks of the principal are. Thus, from an analysis of previous efforts, personal experience, and the input of present and former principals, we proffer what we believe to be a more accurate conceptualization of the task of the principal.

Conceptually, it seems logical to assume that the task of the school principal consists of functions in the following broad categories: school management; educational leadership; teacher and staff personnel; student personnel; and parent and community relations. The functions or activities that are included in these categories are indicated below.

School Management is defined as those activities which keep the school functioning smoothly. Duties and responsibilities included here are:

Managing the school office
Coordinating the work of the school secretary
Planning and preparing school budget
Managing budget for special state or federal programs
Preparing requested school reports
Preparing school class schedule
Supervising the school cafeteria
Supervising bus loading
Supervising the school grounds
Monitoring special state or federal programs
Becoming familiar with guidelines for special state or federal programs

Educational leadership provides the stimulus for maintaining (and improving, where necessary) the school's performance. Included here are the following duties and responsibilities:

Evaluating school programs
Evaluating special state and federal programs
Supervising and evaluating school staffs
Preparing proposals for funding
Developing or revising school policies or procedures
Developing new educational programs and projects
Planning and conducting staff in-service programs
Training staff for special state or federal programs
Conducting faculty meetings

In the area of teachers and staff personnel the principal should assist in the professional development of teachers and staff, and should be concerned about their personal needs. Duties and responsibilities are:

Meeting with teachers individually and in groups
Teaching or covering classes for teachers
Mediating teacher or staff personnel problems or concerns

The area of student personnel refers to efforts to better understand students, to involve them in school policy formulations, and to assist them in dealing with some of their personal needs. Duties and responsibilities included here are:

Meeting with students individually and in groups
Handling student discipline
Caring for health needs of students

Increasingly, schools should seek and maintain broadly-based community and parental support if they wish to maintain fiscal and moral support adequate to sustain a broad educational program. Obviously, such support must be earned, and clear lines of communication established and maintained. Thus, parent and community relations is the final broad category of the task of the principal. The duties and responsibilities in

this area include:

Meeting with individual parents
Meeting with parent groups (PTA, parent clubs, etc.)
Meeting with school community groups
Participating in school community activities
Working with school community groups
Developing and establishing school and public relations
Ensuring community involvement

The usefulness of this conceptualization of the task of the principal will be determined as we examine the duties and responsibilities of principals in this study.

Chapter III

Findings

Principal Characteristics

Demographic. The majority of principals in this study are men: 38 men (83%); and five women (12%). At the senior high school level no principals were women; however, two women were principals of intermediate schools (one urban and one rural school) and three women were principals of elementary schools (two urban and one suburban school). The predominance of male principals at the senior high level reflects the earlier findings of Hemphill, Richards, and Peterson,[41] and at the elementary school level, the findings of the Department of Elementary School Principals[42] and Becker, et al.[43] Table 3 displays the distribution of principals by sex.

Table 3

Distribution of Principals by Sex

Principal's Sex	School Level and Location									Totals
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Female	0	--	--	1	--	1	2	1	--	5(12%)
Male	3	4	2	5	4	1	9	9	1	38(83%)
Totals	3 (7%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	11 (26%)	10 (23%)	1 (2%)	43(100%)

The majority of the principals are between 40-59 years of age. The median age of elementary school principals is 50 years, for intermediate school principals 46 years, and for senior high principals 51 years. The youngest principals in the sample are rural elementary and intermediate principals whose median age is 34.5 years; the oldest principals are found in suburban senior high schools (median age 54.5 years). Evidently, older principals seek a higher school level principalship, or else they have held their positions for a longer period of time. Rural school principals are significantly younger than others (X^2 (6) = 15.02, $p < .05$). Table 4 displays the age distribution of principals.

Table 4

Distribution of Principals by Age

School Level and Location	Age Range 30-39	40-49	50-59	60 and above	Totals
Senior High					
Urban		1	2		3
Suburban		1	2	1	4
Rural		2			2
Intermediate					
Urban		4	2		6
Suburban		2	2		4
Rural	2				2
Elementary					
Urban	1	4	6		11
Suburban	1	4	3	2	10
Rural	1				1
Totals	5 (12%)	18 (42%)	17 (40%)	3 (7%)	43 (100%)

Regardless of the school location in which principals currently serve, the majority (53%) of them grew up in urban communities. Nine percent of them grew up in a combined urban-rural setting, and 7% in a combined urban-suburban setting. Nineteen percent of them grew up in rural settings, 9% in suburban areas, and 2% in combined rural and suburban locations. (See Table 5.) The findings here contrast rather sharply with those of the Senior High School Principalship study, which found that a majority of principals grew up in small towns and in rural areas.[44] Our findings of a predominance of principals with urban backgrounds may be due to the major metropolitan area contained in the geographical location where this study was conducted. In constrast, the Senior High Principalship study used a national sample, which undoubtedly contained more rural areas.

Table 5

Distribution of Principals by Type Community in Which They Grew Up

Type Community	School Level and Location									Totals
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Urban	2	3	1	2	3	1	7	4	-	23 (53%)
Rural	1		1	1	1			3	1	8 (19%)
Suburban		1		3						4 (9%)
Urban and Rural						1	1	2		4 (9%)
Urban and Suburban							3			3 (7%)
Rural and Suburban								1		1 (2%)
N =	3 (7%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	11 (26%)	10 (23%)	1 (2%)	43 (100%)

Educational Background. Most principals, regardless of school level or location, attended public elementary (84%) and senior high schools (91%) as shown in Table 6. Whether this fact bears a direct relationship to their current principalships is not clear. However, there is a high level of congruence between the type of elementary and secondary schools they attended - public - and the type schools in which they currently hold principalships - public. This finding is consistent with that reported in an earlier study by Hemphill, Richards, and Peterson for senior high schools.[45] Importantly, we find no major differences in the type of elementary and secondary schools attended by principals on the basis of school level or school location.

Table 6

Type School in Which Elementary and Secondary Education Received

Type School Attended	School Level and Location									Totals
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Elementary Public	3	3	2	5	3	2	9	8	1	36 (84%)
Religious		1		1	1		2	2		7 (16%)
Private*										
Intermediate Public	3	3	2	5	4	2	8	8	1	36 (84%)
Religious		1		1			2	2		6 (14%)
Private								1		1 (2%)
Senior High Public	3	4	2	5	4	2	8	10	1	39 (91%)
Religious				1			2			3 (7%)
Private							1			1 (2%)
N =	3 (7%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	11 (26%)	10 (23%)	1 (2%)	43 (100%)

*Private = non-religious

At the undergraduate and graduate level, it is apparent that the majority of principals attended public colleges and universities in California. All principals held the bachelor's degree, 40 of them (93%) held the master's degree and six (14%) held the doctorate degree. Less than 25% of the principals at any school level attended schools outside of California. Within California, fewer than 20% of the principals at any school level attended a private college or university.

At the bachelor's degree level, urban and suburban elementary and intermediate school principals tended to study at California private colleges and universities to a much greater extent than senior high principals. At the master's degree level, however, elementary urban and suburban principals tended to study at private California institutions more than other principals. Of the six doctoral degrees held by principals in this study, three were held by senior high principals, one each for urban, suburban and rural schools, and three by intermediate school principals, one urban and two rural schools. Five of the doctorates were the Ed.D. and one held by an intermediate urban school principal was the Ph.D. By school level, the number of doctoral degrees held by principals in this study is a much higher percentage (14%) than that reported in an earlier study of senior high principals, in which only 3% of the principals held doctorate degrees.[46] However, since no elementary principal held the doctorate, our percentage is lower than that reported in a previous national study, which found that about 2% of the elementary principals held doctorate degrees.[47]

The increased proportion of senior high and intermediate principals holding doctoral degrees is encouraging. This finding may simply reflect

the increased number of doctorates earned in education and the greater flexibility of university doctoral programs (which makes it more convenient in terms of residency requirements to earn this advanced degree), or this finding may reflect the growth of non-traditional doctoral programs, which are tailored to fit the practicing administrator's time schedule, thus enabling more principals to seek the doctoral degree. The reasons for the lack of doctoral degrees among elementary principals is not apparent from our data.

Most principals earned the bachelor's degree during the period of 1945-55 and the master's degree during 1956-65 period. Most doctoral degrees were earned during the 1966-75 period. No significant differences between principals were observed regarding the time degrees were earned when viewed by school level and school type as displayed in Table 7. Relatively few bachelors and masters degrees were earned before 1946 and only one doctoral degree was earned in the 1956-65 period.

The undergraduate major field of study for principals displays considerable variation, although those of education and physical education retained a slight edge. Generally, a majority of elementary principals majored in education at the undergraduate level, while intermediate principals majored in physical education and senior high principals in the social sciences. The primary minor field of undergraduate study for all principals was the social sciences.

The undergraduate major field of study for a majority of senior high school principals in this study - the social sciences - differs sharply from the results of Hemphill, Richards and Peterson, who in their earlier study[48] found a descriptively significant percentage of senior high principals with the humanities and social sciences as their major academic fields.

Table 7

Undergraduate and Graduate Degrees Earned by Principals by Years, by School Level and Location

When Degrees Earned by Principal	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Bachelors										
Before 1946		2		1	1		1	2		7 (16%)
1946 - 1955	3	1	2	5	3	1	7	5		27 (63%)
1956 - 1965		1				1	3	3	1	9 (21%)
N =	3 (7%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	11 (26%)	10 (23%)	1 (2%)	43 (100%)
Masters										
Before 1946		1						1		2 (5%)
1946 - 1955	3	2		2	1		4	1		13 (31%)
1956 - 1965		1	2	4	3		5	6	1	22 (52%)
1966 - 75						2	2	1		5 (12%)
N =	3 (7%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)	11 (26%)	9 (21%)	1 (2%)	42 (100%)
Doctorate Ed.D.										
1956 - 65	1									1 (17%)
1966 - 1975		1	1			2				4 (67%)
Doctorate Ph.D.										
1966 - 1975				1						1 (17%)
N =	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)		2 (33%)				6 (100%)

Within each school level, the undergraduate majors of urban, suburban, and rural school principals are quite similar. Table 8 displays the distribution of undergraduate majors and minors of principals by school level and location; Table 9 displays the distribution for graduate majors and minors.

Pre-Service Course Usefulness. Irrespective of the undergraduate major of principals, it is clear that specialized university training for the principalship was not received by them until graduate level study. Since in many schools basic administration graduate courses are required either for administrative credentials or advanced degrees, thereby ensuring similarity in university programs, we asked principals how useful they thought these courses were for their present position. For courses in general school administration, curriculum development, school finance/economics, school personnel management, school organization, education and the law, internship/field experience, teacher negotiations, or supervision/evaluation, principals were asked to indicate whether the course was very useful, somewhat useful, not useful, not offered, or not taken.

The internship is most frequently noted as being very useful by principals, regardless of school level (39%). Other courses, principals indicate as being very useful are education and the law (27%), general school administration (22%), and school finance (20%). By school level, differences are noted in courses perceived as very useful; elementary and intermediate school principals (58%) indicate the internship or field experience, while senior high principals (89%) indicate general school administration. For the courses checked as somewhat useful, the majority of senior high school principals indicate school finance (89%), while the majority of intermediate and elementary principals (76%) indicate general school administration.

Table 8

Distribution of Undergraduate Major and Minor Fields of Study

Number of Principals Studying in Various Fields by School Level and Location

Field of Study	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Business Major				1			1	2		4 (9%)
Minor					1					1 (2%)
Education Major	1						3	3	1	8 (19%)
Minor										
Fine Arts Major							2			2 (5%)
Minor							3			3 (7%)
Humanities Major		2		1	2		2	1		8 (19%)
Minor		1		1	1		1	2		6 (14%)
Physical or Biological Sciences Major		1		1				2		4 (9%)
Minor	1	1	1	1				3	1	8 (19%)
Physical Education Major		1	1	2	1	1		2		8 (19%)
Minor		1								1 (2%)
Social Sciences Major	3				1	1	2			7 (16%)
Minor	3	1	1	1	3	2	3	4		18 (42%)
Other Major			1	1						2 (5%)
N =	3 (7%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	11 (26%)	10 (23%)	1 (2%)	43 (100%)

Table 9

Distribution of Graduate Major and Minor Fields of Study

Number of Principals Studying in Various Fields by School Level and Location

Masters Level Major/Minor	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Educational Administration Major	3	3	1	3	2	2	9	8	1	32 (80%)
Minor		1								1 (3%)
Fine Arts Major				1			1			2 (5%)
Minor										
Humanities Major		1								1 (3%)
Minor										
Physical Education Major				1	1					2 (5%)
Minor										
Social Sciences Major					1			1		2 (5%)
Minor	1	1		1	1		2	1		7 (18%)
Curriculum and Instruction Major										
Minor										
Industrial Arts Major			1							1 (3%)
Doctoral Level Major Educational Administration	1	1	1	1		2				6 (15%)
N =	3 (8%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)	5 (13%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)	10 (25%)	9 (23%)	1 (3%)	40 (100%)

Combining course ratings of "very useful" and "somewhat useful" for all principals, based on 41 responses, principals placed general school administration first (88%), school finance second (83%), education and the law third (80%), supervision and evaluation and school organization tied for fourth (73%), curriculum development sixth (71%), personnel management seventh (63%), internship eighth (54%), and teacher negotiations ninth (27%). The relatively low ranking of the internship and teacher negotiations may be attributable to the fact that many principals report that these courses were not offered or that they did not take them during pre-service preparation. Sixty-six percent of the principals indicate teacher negotiations either was not offered or they did not take the course, 41%, including all senior high principals, indicate the same for the internship or field experience, and 20% for personnel management. These findings came as no surprise; requirement of most of these courses in principal preparation programs is a relatively recent phenomenon.

More elementary school principals considered several courses as "not useful" than did intermediate and senior high school principals. These courses were school organization (29%), curriculum development (29%), personnel management (19%), supervision and evaluation (19%) and education and the law (19%). When combining elementary, intermediate and senior high school principals, the primary courses most (27%) indicate as being not useful are curriculum development and school organization.

In examining the response for pre-service preparation course usefulness by school location, no descriptively significant differences are found. Differences in the perceptions of elementary and intermediate principals when contrasted with senior high principals regarding courses they rate as very

useful can be explained partially by course availability. The distribution of responses on course usefulness is displayed in Appendix B, Table B4 p. 166.

The findings reported here vary somewhat from the findings of two earlier studies. Becker, et al., report that the course work considered most significant by elementary principals was interpersonal relations, followed by general school administration, public relations and community relations, curriculum, and supervision and evaluation.[49] However, Becker, et al., report that the internship is viewed by principals as the most significant training experience for the principalship; and this parallels our findings.

At the senior high school level, Hemphill, Richards, and Peterson report that those courses believed to be absolutely essential by principals are supervision of instruction, personnel administration, human relations, secondary school organization, curriculum development, and administrative theory and practice.[50] In this study, the only course viewed as "very useful" by a majority of senior high principals was general school administration.

Although the reasons for the differences between the findings of this study and those of the other studies cited are not readily apparent, consideration must be given to the regional nature of our sample as opposed to the national sample used in the other studies.

From a somewhat different view of the usefulness of formal course work, principals were asked to indicate the kinds of pre-service courses or experiences that would have been most helpful for their present position. Responding to this open-ended question, the greatest number of principals (37%) indicate that courses dealing with staff development and supervision and evaluation would have been most helpful to them. Curriculum development

and assessment is mentioned by only one senior high school principal, but by 20% of the elementary principals; and it is the second most frequently-mentioned area of courses. Although courses in curriculum and instruction traditionally have been part of administrator-preparation programs, apparently these courses, as taught during the preparation of elementary school principals in this study, did not meet their needs.

Other courses or experiences principals indicate could have been most helpful to them in their present position cover a wide range. While none of the courses or experiences are mentioned by more than 15% of the principals, still we have some indication of the kinds of skills principals perceive they need. The total list of responses may be found in Table 10, and includes, in addition to those mentioned above, courses or experiences dealing with parent and community involvement, program evaluation, human relations, and communication skills. Some of the desired course experiences could be incorporated in new configurations of existing university courses. For example, curriculum development might include human development, individualized learning, and assessment; human relations, time management, communication skills, program evaluation, and change strategies could be conceived as part of organizational development. Other courses that principals mention (e.g., educational law, internship, finance) are presently offered in most university principal preparation programs, but may not have been offered during the period of study of the principals surveyed.

No clear pattern of courses or experiences emerge for principals by school level or location, except that noted for elementary principals (who indicate courses or experiences in the areas of curriculum development and assessment would have been most helpful to them in their present positions to a greater extent than do principals at other levels).

Table 10

Pre-Service Courses or Experiences That Would Have Been Most Helpful to Principals in Their Present Positions

Courses or Experiences	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban (N=2)	Suburban (N=4)	Rural (N=2)	Urban (N=5)	Suburban (N=2)	Rural (N=1)	Urban (N=10)	Suburban (N=8)	Rural (N=1)	
Budgeting and Finance	1	1		1				2		5 (14%)
Change Strategies							1	1		2 (6%)
Communication Skills							2	2		4 (11%)
Curriculum Development and Assessment	1						2	4	1	8 (23%)
Education Law	1							2		3 (9%)
Evaluation, program							1	4		5 (14%)
Human Development								3		3 (9%)
Human Relations						1	1	1		3 (9%)
Individualized learning					1			2		3 (9%)
Internship, reality based courses		2		1	1		1			5 (14%)
Liberal Arts Courses							1			1 (3%)
Master Program Making	1			1						2 (6%)
Organizational Development	1			1			1	1		4 (11%)

Cont'd

Table 10 (Cont'd)

Pre-Service Courses or Experiences That Would Have Been Most Helpful to Principals in Their Present Positions

Courses or Experiences	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Parent/Community Involvement					1	1	2	1	1	6 (17%)
Politics							1	1		2 (6%)
Self defense							1			1 (3%)
Staff dev., Supervision, Evaluation	2	1	2	1	1		3	2	1	13 (37%)
Time Management	1			1			1	3		6 (17%)
No Response	1			1	2	1	1	2		8
N =	2 (6%)	4 (11%)	2 (6%)	5 (14%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	10 (29%)	8 (23%)	1 (3%)	35 (100%)

In-Service Education. An important dimension in the education of principals is provided by in-service programs, which may be viewed as a form of continuing education. These programs usually grow out of the perceived needs of principals, and are sponsored by school districts, professional associations, and colleges and universities. How useful have these programs been, in what areas have they been focused and which group or groups have been most active in sponsoring them during the past three years - these are questions of concern here.

Let us begin with the latter question. School districts were the major sponsors of in-service programs in which principals participated during the last three years by a margin of two to one. Seventeen different programs were sponsored by them. A professional group for administrators, the Association of California School Administrators, was the second most frequent sponsor, with seven workshops. Other groups cited as sponsoring in-service programs were the California State Department of Education (1), Westinghouse Learning Corporation (1), colleges (2), and the National Training Laboratory (1).

School district in-service programs focused on the following areas:

Administrative Practices
Behavioral Modification
Conflict Resolution
Finance
Goal Setting
Human Relations
Individualized Instruction
Innovations
Management by Objectives
Managing Federal and State Programs
Multicultural Education
Problem Solving
Program Development
Program Planning
Teacher Evaluation
Vocational Education

In-service programs sponsored by the California administrators' professional group, ACSA, includes Innovations, Junior High/Middle School, Leadership and Management, Parent Education, School Budgeting, Supervision, and Teacher Evaluation. Programs sponsored by other groups include: Individualized Instruction - Westinghouse Learning Corporation; Organizational Development - National Training Laboratory; Vocational Education and Multicultural Education - California State Department of Education. Colleges and universities sponsored an Administrative Extern program, and lectures on schools without failure and effective education.

Many of the in-service programs focused on areas not generally included in college and university pre-service programs for principals. Thus, these programs provide help to principals in areas of perceived need, and also provide an indication of the type of learning experiences preparation programs should include. The majority of in-service programs were reported by principals to be "very useful" on a three-point scale that included "very useful," "somewhat useful," and "not useful."

Elementary principals tended to participate in in-service programs that were in the humanistic area; senior high principals, in programs dealing more directly with management. In-service programs in which the participation of elementary and intermediate school principals overlapped tended to be those dealing with general school administration. No clear pattern was evident for differences in participation by principals based on school location. Table B5 displays the distribution and perceptions of usefulness of in-service programs in which principals participated during the past three years (see Appendix B, p. 169.

Principals were also asked what in-service programs would have been most helpful to them in their present positions. Although no single program

emerges from a majority of principals, the most frequently-mentioned programs include school site visits and discussions with other principals (26%), teacher and staff evaluation, and planning and managing budgets (13%). Other programs less frequently mentioned include individualized instruction, organizational development, communication skills and human relations. The complete list of programs is shown in Table 11. Most in-service program areas that principals feel would have been most helpful to them are also mentioned by a large percentage of them as desirable pre-service courses and experiences. Principals may feel that as pre-service courses and experiences these areas would be more thoroughly covered. Alternatively, they may believe that pre-service rather than in-service should be the level at which necessary administrative preparation should be accomplished.

Credentials Held. Another dimension in the educational background of principals is seen in the credentials they hold. Not surprisingly, the primary type of California credentials held by principals are general elementary teaching and administration, general secondary teaching and administration, and general administration. Table 12 displays the distribution of credentials held by principals for level and school location.

Since credential requirements for the principalship are determined at the state level, state requirements must be viewed as a major reason for the similarity in the professional educational background of principals. Credentials are, of course, important in ensuring entry level standards. However, the requirements for the credential must constantly be assessed if preparation programs are to be effective. In examining the usefulness of various college and university preparation courses for the principalship, we

Table 11

Inservice Programs That Would Have Been
Most Helpful to Principals in Their Present Positions

Inservice Programs	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban (N=2)	Suburban (N=3)	Rural (N=2)	Urban (N=4)	Suburban (N=2)	Rural (N=1)	Urban (N=10)	Suburban (N=7)	Rural (N=0)	N=31
Budgets--Planning and Management	1		1	1			1			9 (13%)
Community/ Parent Involvement						1	1			2 (6%)
Communication Skills					1		1			2 (6%)
Conflict Management							1			1 (3%)
Curriculum Development	1		1				1			3 (10%)
Early Childhood Ed. Programs								2		2 (6%)
Educational Law	1						1	1		3 (10%)
Group Process					1					1 (3%)
Human Relations							2			2 (6%)
Individualized Instruction								2		2 (6%)
Organizational Development							1	1		2 (6%)
Program Planning and Implementation					1			1		2 (6%)

Cont'd

Table 11 (Cont'd)

Inservice Programs That Would Have Been
Most Helpful to Principals in Their Present Positions

Inservice Programs	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
School site vists, discussion w/ other principals	1	3		1	1		1	1		8 (26%)
Staff Development	1							1		2 (6%)
Teacher Negotiations	1							1		2 (6%)
Teacher/Staff Evaluation				1	1		2	1		5 (16%)
Time Management	1									1 (3%)
No Response	1	1		2	2	1	1	3	1	12
N =	2 (6%)	3 (10%)	2 (6%)	4 (13%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	10 (32%)	7 (23%)	-	31 (100%)

*Percentages do not total 100% due to multiple repsonses from some principals.

Table 12

Type California Credentials Held by Principals

Type Credential	Number of Principals Holding Credentials by School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
General Elementary Teaching	3	4	1	2	2	2	11	10	1	36 (84%*
Administration	1				1	2	5	8	1	18 (42%)
General Secondary Teaching	3	4	2	4	4	2	2	4	1	26 (60%)
Administration	1			4	2	2	1	3		13 (30%)
General Administration	3	4	2		4		6	2	1	22 (51%)
Standard Administration				1						1 (2%)
Standard Supervision			1	2	1		1	1		6 (14%)
Pupil Personnel			1				1			2 (5%)
Driver Education			1							1 (2%)
Jr. High Teaching						1	1	1		3 (7%)
Reading Specialist							1	1		2 (5%)
Secondary Music								1		1 (2%)
Orthopedic								1		1 (2%)
N =	3 (7%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	11 (26%)	10 (23%)	1 (2%)	43 (100%)

* Percentages do not total 100% due to the multiple responses from some principals.

found that several of the professional education courses were not considered very useful. Since these course offerings are influenced by state credential requirements, changes in them may best be influenced at that level. In fact, perhaps the fastest way to bring about changes in pre-service educational requirements for principals is by changing the credential requirements. Such a change was initiated in California in 1973, in the form of a competency-based administration preparation program.[51] Whether the educational requirements for preparing principals reflect the perceptions of what principals believe should be included in such programs is yet to be determined.

Experience Background. Principals in this study have had considerable teaching and administrative experience. Senior high and intermediate school principals have tended to hold teaching positions in secondary schools, while the experience of elementary school principals has been in elementary schools. Intermediate suburban school principals have taught longer (mean of 9.8 years) than other principals, and intermediate rural school principals less (mean of 3.6 years). Generally, elementary school principals, regardless of present school location, did their teaching in poor and lower class schools; intermediate and senior high principals in middle class schools.

The primary type of administrative experience principals had prior to assuming a principalship was gained in the position of a vice principal. They obtained this experience at the same school level as the schools in which they now serve as principals. Suburban intermediate and senior high principals, regardless of school level, served as vice principals for a longer period (means of nine and six years respectively) than elementary

principals. Other pre-principal administrative experiences include department head, counselor, supervisor, administrative assistant and the like. The number of principals serving in these positions is relatively small, however. The distribution of principals by teaching and administrative experience is displayed in Table 13.

Overall, the majority of principals (42%) have been principals of their present schools from four to six years. About half of the elementary principals (55%), and one-fifth of the intermediate principals (22%) have been principals of their present schools for one to three years. Generally, senior high and intermediate principals have served longer (seven years to above ten years) in their present schools than elementary principals. This finding is not totally unexpected since senior high and intermediate principals are older and thus have had more time to hold principalships. The number of years principals have been in their present position is shown in Table 14 below.

Table 14

Length of Time Principal at Present School

Years at Present School	Number of Principals by School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
1 - 3			1	3	1		6	4	1	16 (37%)
4 - 6	1	3		1	2	2	4	5		18 (42%)
7 - 9	1	1						1		3 (7%)
10 and above	1		1	2	1		1			6 (14%)
N =	3 (7%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	11 (26%)	10 (23%)	1 (2%)	43 (100%)

Table 13

Previous Professional Educational Experience of Principals

Educational Professional Experience	Number Years Experience by School Level and Location																											
	Senior High									Intermediate									Elementary									
	Urban (N = 3)			Suburban (N = 4)			Rural (N=2)			Urban (N = 6)			Suburban (N = 4)			Rural (N=2)			Urban (N = 11)			Suburban (N = 10)			Rural (N = 1)		
	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}$	SD
Teaching Elementary				1	5	-				1	7	-				1	1	-	9	8.2	5.2	9	6.7	4.2	1	9	-
Secondary	2	6.5	3.5	4	4.5	3	2	5.5	4.9	4	5.5	4.2	4	9.8	3.5	2	5.5	3.5	2	6.5	2.1	1	8				
*Total Teaching	2	6.5	3.5	5	4.6	2.6	2	5.5	4.9	5	5.8	3.7	4	9.8	3.5	3	4	3.6	11	7.9	4.7	10	6.6	4.2	1	9	-
Vice Principal Elementary																			5	3.4	2.1	2	3.5	2.1			
Secondary	2	8	1.4	2	6	7.1	2	2	1.4	3	7.3	6.8	3	9	7.2	1	2	-				2	6	4.2	1	4	-
*Total as V.P.	2	8	1.4	2	6	7.1	2	2	1.4	3	7.3	6.8	3	9	7.2	1	2	-	5	3.4	2.1	4	4.8	3.1	1	4	-
Principal Elementary				1	7	-										1	2	-	9	10.1	7.7	9	11.1	7.8			
Secondary	3	10.7	7.4	4	13.8	7.7	2	8.5	2.1	4	8.3	8.3	5	8.6	5.5	2	5.5	.71	1	5	-				1	1	-
*Total as Prin.	3	10.7	7.4	5	12.4	7.3	2	8.5	2.1	4	8.3	8.3	5	8.6	5.5	3	4.3	2.1	10	9.6	7.4	9	11.4	7.8	1	1	-
Supervisor/Director Research Office Elementary																			3	7.3	6.8	1	2	-			
Secondary	1	2	-													1	4	-									
*Total	1	2	-													1	4	-	3	7.3	6.8	1	2	-			
Teach./VP/Ad. Asst/ Curr.Asst/Act.Prin. Elementary																			2	1.5	.71	2	2.5	2.1			
5/ Secondary										2	1	-															
*Total										2	1	-							2	1.5	.71	2	2.5	2.1			
De. Head/Coun/Dean/ Consult./Tea.-Coun. Elementary																											
Secondary	1	3	-	1	6	-	1	3	-	2	5.5	4.9							1	10	-						
*Total	1	3	-	1	6	-	1	3	-	2	5.5	4.9							1	10	-						
No Response										1																	

Elementary principals in this study have had considerably more teaching and administrative experience than those in an earlier study of elementary school principals conducted by Gross and Herriott.[52] In that study, Gross and Herriott found that the mean for the teaching experience of elementary principals was 2.16 years; for years in a principalship, 2.16 years; and for years in their present position (at the time of the study), 2.11 years. In contrast, Hemphill, Griffiths and Frederiksen's study of elementary school principals revealed that the mean for administrative experience for women principals was 13.2, and for men, 9.5.[53]

For senior high principals, Hemphill, Richards and Peterson found that the median number of years in the principalship was about eight.[54] Since it is not known what constituted teaching or administrative experience in the above studies, comparisons are restricted. It is apparent from our data, however, that principals have generally followed a career pattern of teacher, vice principal, principal. Combining teaching and administrative experience, most urban and suburban principals have been in education more than 20 years; the majority of rural principals less than 20 years (X^2 (4) = 15.80, $P<.05$).

Another important dimension of the principals' experiential background is experience acquired outside of the education profession. In that regard, it can be noted that more than half the principals have held jobs outside of education since graduating from college (see Table 15). The most frequently-mentioned positions held by principals fall into the professional and technical classifications, and are business related. Most non-educational experiences mentioned were acquired in settings in which considerable human interaction was required.

Table 15

Previous Non-Educational Experiences of Principals
After College Graduation

Occupational Group	Number of Principals Employed in Job Category by School Level and Location									*Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Professional & Technical	1	6	1	2	3		6	5		24 (92%)
Managers and Admin. except Farm					1					1 (4%)
Sales Workers			1		3		1			5 (19%)
Craftsmen and Kindred Worker	1						1			2 (8%)
Other Service Workers	2		1		1		1			5 (19%)
Farm Laborers and Foremen			1							1 (4%)
No Repsonse				2	2	1	4	8		17
N =	3 (12%)	4 (15%)	2 (8%)	4 (15%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	7 (27%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	26 (100%)

*Percentages do not total 100% because of multiple entries from some Principals.

Having elicited information concerning professional and non-professional educational experiences, we made an attempt to determine which experiences principals thought were most useful in assisting them to function effectively in their present positions. Responses relative to this open-ended inquiry were received from 34 principals, and are displayed in Table 16.

Surprisingly, the experiences most frequently mentioned as useful preparation for the principalship are those acquired outside the field of professional education. Several principals, particularly at the elementary school level, feel that their experiences outside of professional education helped them to understand, tolerate and appreciate human diversity, and to relate to people in an effective manner. Of the educational experiences mentioned, the internship is perceived to be a useful prerequisite for the principalship. This latter finding reflects earlier results of studies of the elementary school principals, in which Becker, et al.,[55] and Melton[56] report that principals feel strongly that the internship is an important dimension of preparation for the principalship. It also reflects our earlier finding that principals view the internship as a very useful pre-service course.

The perceptions of principals in this study raise important questions for preparation programs which, of course, should be investigated more fully. If the human relations aspect of working with others, and in relating effectively to others, is important for effectiveness as a principal, then ways should be explored to enhance that quality among present and future principals.

Table 16

Most Useful Educational or Non-Educational Experiences for Present Principalship

Type Experience	Number of Principals Indicating Experience by School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Educational Teaching				1	1			1		3 (9%)
Administrative	2		1	1						4 (12%)
Internship		1			1	1	2	1		6 (18%)
Counselor				1						1 (3%)
Non-Educational Professional & Technical	1	1		1			3	3		9 (26%)
Sales Worker					1		2	1		4 (12%)
Personal		3					3			6 (18%)
Military							1	1		2 (6%)
No Response	1		1		2			5		9
N =	2 (6%)	4 (12%)	1 (3%)	6 (18%)	2 (6%)	2 (6%)	11 (32%)	5 (15%)	1 (3%)	34 (100%)

* Percentages do not equal 100% because of multiple entries from some principals.

School Characteristics

Grade Organizational Patterns. Schools in which principals serve include a wide range of grade organizational patterns, particularly at the elementary level. In the main, however, senior high schools include either grades 9 to 12 or 10 to 12; intermediate schools include either grades 7 and 8 or 7 to 9; and, elementary schools grades K-6. Rural intermediate schools include grades 6 to 8 and one rural high school contains grades 7 to 12. Urban and suburban schools regardless of grade level were generally similar. Thus, with the exception of the rural schools noted above, the majority of principals in this study hold positions in schools with similar patterns of grade organization within each school level. The organizational grade patterns noted here are similar to those found in previous studies of senior high schools[57] and elementary schools.[58] Table 17 displays the grades found in the schools included in this study.

Student Family Income Level. The majority of principals indicate that the annual family income of their students ranges from $8,000 to $13,999. Three suburban elementary schools and one urban high school had a majority of students from families whose incomes were above $20,000. Generally, more suburban schools had students from higher family income brackets than rural or urban schools. The distribution of schools by income is reported in Table 18.

Size of Teaching Staff. Most urban and suburban senior high schools have full-time teaching staffs of 50 to 75, while two of them (one urban and one subrban) have full-time staffs of 75 to 100. At the intermediate school level, the majority of urban and suburban schools have full-time teaching staffs of 25 to 49, although a few of them have larger staffs (50-74). Schools with the smallest staffs are elementary schools and rural schools regardless of grade level.

Table 17

Grade Organizational Pattern for School Location Within School Level

Grade Organization	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
k - 3							1			1 (2%)
k - 4							2			2 (5%)
k - 5								1		1 (2%)
k - 6							5	8	1	14 (33%)
k - 7							1			1 (2%)
k - 8								1		1 (2%)
k - 10							1			1 (2%)
4 - 6							1			1 (2%)
6 - 8						2				2 (5%)
7 - 8				3	2					5 (12%)
7 - 9				3	2					5 (12%)
7 - 12			1							1 (2%)
9 - 12	2	1	1							4 (10%)
10 - 12	1	3								4 (10%)
N =	3 (7%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	11 (26%)	10 (23%)	1 (2%)	43 (100%)

Table 18

Students' Family Income for School Location Within School Level

Family Income Level	Principals Reporting Various Student Family Income Level									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
$20,000 +	1							3		4 (9%)
$14,000 - $19,999		2		2			1	4		9 (21%)
$8,000 - $13,999		2	1	4	4		4	3	1	19 (44%)
$4,000 - $7,999	2		1			2	3			8 (19%)
Below $4,000							1			1 (2%)
Mixed $4,000 - $13,999							1			1 (2%)
Mixed $4,000 - $20,000							1			1 (2%)
N =	3 (7%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	11 (26%)	10 (23%)	1 (2%)	43 (100%)

Aside from regular teaching staff, the majority of schools (53%) have teachers for the educationally handicapped. Furthermore, many elementary and senior high schools have specialists in reading and mathematics. Although most of the senior high schools and many of the intermediate schools have teachers for the educable mentally retarded, few elementary schools do.

The sizes of the teaching staffs for the various schools included in our study are displayed in Table 19. Except for rural intermediate and senior high schools, the majority of regular full-time teaching staffs are similar in size within each school level regardless of location. High schools have the largest staffs, elementary schools the smallest. About one-half of the intermediate and senior high schools and one-fourth of the elementary schools employed part-time teaching staff.

Size of Non-Teaching Staff. Non-teaching staff in the school represents an additional supervisory and evaluative responsibility for the principal. In view of this, we attempted to ascertain the size of the non-teaching staff with which principals typically must be concerned. The size of non-teaching staff varies by school location and level. Urban schools generally have more non-teaching staff than suburban or rural schools; suburban schools more than rural ones. Concomitantly, senior high schools, which are larger, have more non-teaching staff than intermediate and elementary schools, and intermediate more than elementary. Thus, there is a direct relationship between the level and location of the school and non-teaching staff: urban senior high schools have larger staffs, rural elementary schools smaller ones. Non-teaching staff can be categorized in relationship to function: administrative assistants; teacher assistance or support; student support; plant maintenance and security; and clerical.

Table 19

Size of Teaching Staff for
School Location within School Level

Size of Teaching Staff	Principals Reporting Various Teaching Staff Sized																				Total N=43 (100%)	
	Senior High						Intermediate						Elementary									
	Urban (N = 3) (7%)		Suburban (N = 4) (9%)		Rural (N = 2) (5%)		Urban (N = 6) (14%)		Suburban (N = 4) (9%)		Rural (N = 2) (5%)		Urban (N = 11) (26%)		Suburban (N = 10) (23%)		Rural (N = 1) (2%)			
	*F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T
Regular Faculty 75-100	1		1																2 5%	
50-74	2		3				2		1										8 19%	
25-49							3		3				3						9 21%	
1-25		2		1	2	2	1	4		2	2		8	2	10	3	1		24 56%	14 33%
Specialist-Reading or Math 1 - 2	1		3		1		1					1	4	2	3	2			13 30%	5 12%
3 - 4	1						1						2						4 9%	
EMR 1 - 2	2		3		1		4	1	1		1		1		1	1			14 33%	2 5%
EH 1 - 2	3		4		1		5	1	3			2	2	3	5	3		1	23 53%	10 23%
3 - 4															1				1 2%	

*F/T - full time; P/T = part time

Percentages do not add to 100% due to multiple entries by each principal.

Full-time administrative assistants - vice principals and deans - are found in senior high and intermediate schools. Only two urban elementary schools had a vice principal, and none had deans. This latter finding is not unusual, because the majority of elementary principals nationally are without administrative assistants. Senior high school principals in the present study, however, report the presence of assistant or vice principals to a greater degree than that noted by Hemphill, Richards and Peterson. Their study of principals revealed that only one in four principals had an assistant principal.[60] In the present study, all urban and suburban intermediate and high schools have a full-time assistant principal (two urban high schools had three to four full-time assistant principals) and one of the two rural high schools had one part-time assistant principal. Overall, 78% of the high schools have at least one assistant principal.

The classification "teacher support staff" as used here includes instructional and community aides. Irrespective of grade level, instructional aides are found primarily in urban and suburban schools. In most of these schools, there are one to four full- and part-time instructional aides. By school level, we find that some urban and suburban elementary schools have over five full- or part-time instructional aides (29%); all urban and most suburban senior high schools (75%) have between one and eight. At the intermediate school level, full- or part-time aides are found primarily in urban schools (83%). Few schools have regular volunteer community aides.

The support staff for students consists of counselors, librarians, nurses, psychologists, speech therapists, vision therapists, and cafeteria workers. Our findings indicate that almost all schools have either one

full- or part-time librarian and nurse. Urban and suburban high schools have, on an average, four full-time counselors; most rural high schools and urban and suburban intermediate schools have only one to two. Counselors are not prevalent in elementary schools; only nine percent of the schools have them. At the elementary school level, they are found only in urban schools.

All senior high schools have a part-time psychologist, as do most of the intermediate schools (33% urban, 50% suburban, 100% rural), and most of the elementary schools (55% urban, 100% suburban, 100% rural). Interestingly, suburban and rural schools employ school psychologists to a greater extent than do urban schools. Other student support staff as defined here is minimal, except for cafeteria workers, who range in number from one to five in the majority of schools regardless of level or location. Larger full- and part-time cafeteria staffs (more than six) are found in about half the urban and subrban high schools, one-fourth of the suburban intermediate schools, and one-half the urban intermediate schools.

In examining the size of plant maintenance and security staff (custodians, gardeners, campus control and noon supervisors), we find that the majority of staff in this area are custodians. Regardless of location, there is an average number of 2.5 custodians in most intermediate (67%) and elementary schools (87%). The majority of urban (67%) and suburban (75%) senior high schools have, on the average, 6.5 custodians, while rural high schools have an average of 2.5. Most custodial staff are full time. Campus control staff are found primarily in about half the urban and suburban senior high schools. The average size of such staff is two. Very few schools have gardeners or noon supervisors.

Finally, no school indicates not having full-time clerical staff. On the average, the size of such staff is 2.5 positions. Most urban (67%) and half the suburban senior high schools have an average 6.5 clerical staff positions.

The distribution of non-teaching staff for school level and location is displayed in Table 20.

Student Enrollment and Ethnicity. The majority of elementary schools (82%), regardless of location, have enrollments in the range of 200-600 students. At the intermediate level, the majority of urban schools (75%) and suburban schools (75%) have enrollments which range between 601-1,000 students. Rural intermediate and senior high schools are similar in size to elementary schools; enrollments in these schools range between 200-600 students. Urban senior high schools have an enrollment range of 1,001-2,400 students, with a median of 1,600. Half of the suburban high schools have student enrollments ranging between 1,001-1,400, and half between 1,401-1,800 students. Senior high schools in this study are larger than those in an earlier study of the senior high principalship, in which the median enrollment was 325.[61] The range of elementary school student enrollment in this study is about the same as that reported by Becker, et al.[62]

In investigating the student ethnic composition of most schools, we find that the enrollment of minority students - Asian, Black, Chicano, Native Americans - is generally less than 5%. Higher percentages of minority students are found primarily in urban elementary schools. For example, 70% of the urban elementary schools have an Asian student enrollment of 6% to 60%; 80% of them a Black student enrollment of 6% to 60%; and 60% a Chicano student enrollment of 6% to 30%. One urban elementary school has a predominantly

Table 20

Size of Non-Teaching Staff
for School Location Within School Level

Size of Non-Teaching Staff	Principals Reporting Various Non-Teaching Staff Sizes																		Total N = 43 (100%)	
	Senior High						Intermediate						Elementary							
	Urban (N = 3) (7%)		Suburban (N = 4) (9%)		Rural (N = 2) (5%)		Urban (N = 6) (14%)		Suburban (N = 4) (9%)		Rural (N=2) (5%)		Urban (N = 11) (26%)		Suburban (N = 10) (23%)		Rural (N=1) (2%)			
*	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T
Vice Principals 1-2	1		4			1	5		4			1	2	1				1	16 (37%)	4 (9%)
3-4	2						1												3 (7%)	-
Deans 1-2	1		4				1												6 (14%)	-
3-4							1												1 (2%)	-
Counselors 1-2					1	1	4	1	4		1	1	1						11 (26%)	3 (7%)
3-5	1		4				1	1					1						7 (16%)	1 (2%)
6-8	2						1												3 (7%)	-
Librarian - 1	3		4	1	1	1	5	1	4		2		3	5		6			22 (51%)	14 (33%)
Librarian Asst 1			1	1															1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Nurse - 1	2	1		1	1	1	1	5		4		2	1	9		8		1	5 (12%)	32 (74%)
Nurses Aide - 1									1										1 (2%)	-
Psychologist - 1		3		2		1	1	2		2		2	1	6		10		1	2 (5%)	29 (67%)
Clerical 1-4		2		1	2	1	2	2	3	1	2		12	2	6	6	1		28 (65%)	15 (35%)
5-8	2		2				3		1										8 (19%)	- -

* F/T = Full time; P/T = Part time

Cont'd

Table 20 (Cont'd)

Size of Non-Teaching Staff
for School Location Within School Level

Size of Non-Teaching Staff	Principals Reporting Various Non-Teaching Staff Sizes																		Total N = 43 (100%)	
	Senior High						Intermediate						Elementary							
	Urban (N =3) (7%)		Suburban (N = 4) (9%)		Rural (N=2) (5%)		Urban (N = 6) (14%)		Suburban (N = 4) (9%)		Rural (N = 2) (5%)		Urban (N =11) (26%)		Suburban (N = 10) (23%)		Rural (N=1) (2%)			
	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T
Clerical (cont) 9-12	1																		1 (2%)	-
13-16				2																2 (5%)
Instructional Aids (Paid) 1-4	1	1	2			1	4	1	1		1		2		4	1			15 (35%)	4 (9%)
5-8		1		1									1			1			1 (2%)	3 (7%)
9-12													1	1	1				2 (5%)	1 (2%)
Above 12								1					1						1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Community Aides (Volunteer) 1-4				1		1		1		1			2	2					2 (5%)	6 (14%)
Above 5								1			1		2		3				6 (14%)	1 (2%)
Speech Therapist 1								1						1	1				1 (2%)	2 (5%)
Vision Therapist 1								1											-	1 (2%)
Music Accompanist				1															-	1 (2%)
Cafeteria 1-5	1		2	1			2	2	2		1	1	2	9	3	2	1	1	14 (33%)	16 (37%)

Cont'd

Table 20 (Cont'd)

Size of Non-Teaching Staff
for School Location Within School Level

Size of Non-Teaching Staff	Principals Reporting Various Non-Teaching Staff Sizes																				Total	
	Senior High						Intermediate						Elementary								N = 43 (100%)	
	Urban (N = 3) (7%)		Suburban (N = 4) (9%)		Rural (N=2) (5%)		Urban (N = 6) (14%)		Suburban (N = 4) (9%)		Rural (N = 2) (5%)		Urban (N=11) (26%)		Suburban (N = 10) (23%)		Rural (N=1) (2%)			
	F/T*	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T	F/T	P/T
Cafeteria (cont) 6-10	1	1	1					2	1				2						5 (12%)	3 (7%)
Above 10		1	1					1											1 (2%)	2 (5%)
Noon Supervisors 4-6									1				1	1					2 (5%)	1 (2%)
Campus Control Supervision 1-3	2	1	2	1									1						5 (12%)	2 (5%)
4-6		1																	-	1 (2%)
Custodians 1-4		1			2		2	1	2	5	2		12	3	6	4	1		27 (63%)	14 (33%)
5-8	2		3				3		1				1						10 (23%)	-
9-12	1						1												2 (5%)	-
13-16			1																1 (2%)	-
Gardeners 1-2	1	1																	1 (2%)	1 (2%)

* F/T = full time; P/T = part time

black student enrollment. At the senior high level, Chicanos are the largest student ethnic minority group; one-third of the urban schools, half the suburban schools and both rural schools have Chicano student enrollments of 6% to 30%. At the intermediate level, half the urban schools have more than a 6% enrollment of black students, and one-third have an enrollment of more than 6% Chicano students. Urban schools have a better ethnic mix of students at all levels, with the exception of the one predominantly black elementary school noted above. The distribution of both student enrollment and ethnicity is shown in Table 21.

School Program/Organizational Arrangements. A final school characteristic considered here is program and organizational arrangements. The investigation of school arrangements provides a measure of the diversity of programmatic and organizational structure about which the principal must be knowledgeable. Principals were asked to check "yes," "no," or "plan to implement" to indicate whether a list of selected school arrangements were to be found in their schools. The distribution of responses to that list are shown in Table 22.

The majority of all schools regardless of level or location, have structured traditional classrooms (93%), but also make use of team teaching (70%), some form of individualized instruction (i.e., programmed instruction, contract systems, individual learning) (93%), and multi-age grouping (70%). Many schools do not have open classrooms (63%), flexible scheduling (53%), differentiated staffing (72%), or school-within-school programs (77%). Non-graded classrooms and classroom paraprofessionals are also not prevalent in slightly more than half of the schools (51% and 53% respectively).

Table 21

Student Enrollment and Ethnicity
for School Location Within School Level

	Principals Reporting Student Enrollment & Ethnicity by School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Total Student Enrollment 200-600			2		1	2	9	8	1	23
601-1000				4	3			2		9
1001-1400	1	2		2			1			6
1401-1800	1	2								3
Above 1800	1									1
Student Ethnicity by % of Total Enrollment *ASIANS Less than 1%		3	2		4	1		4		14
1% - 5%	2			2		1	2	6	1	14
6% - 30%	1	1		1			6			9
31% - 60%				1			1			2
Black Less than 1%		2	2		4	1	1	6	1	17
1% - 5%	2	2		1		1	1	3		10
6% - 30%	1			2			4			7
31% - 60%				1			3			4
61% - 90%										
91% - 100%							1			1

*Asian includes Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Filipino.

Cont'd

Table 21 (Cont'd)

Student Enrollment and Ethnicity
for School Location Within School Level

	Principals Reporting Student Enrollment & Ethnicity by School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Chicano Less than 1%	1	1					1	2		5
1% - 5%		1		2	3		3	4		13
6% - 30%	1	2	2	2	1	1	6	2		17
31% - 60%	1					1				2
Native American Less than 1%	2	3		4	4	2	2	3		20
1% - 5%	1		2				2	2		7
White Less than 1%										
1% - 5%							1			1
6% - 30%										
31% - 60%	1			2			4	2		9
61% - 90%	2	2	2	2	1	1	5			15
91% - 100%		2			3	1		9	1	16
Other Less than 1%								1		
1% - 5%				2			2			
6% - 10%				1						
No Response							1			
N =	3 (7%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)	10 (24%)	10 (24%)	1 (2%)	42 (100%)

Table 22

School Program/Organizational Arrangements
for School Location Within School Level

Program/ Organizational Arrangement	Response	Principals Indicating Yes, No, or Plan to Implement									Total
		Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
		Urban	Sub.	Rural	Urban	Sub.	Rural	Urban	Sub.	Rural	
Open Classrooms	Yes		3		1			4	6		14 (33%)
	No	3	1	2	5	4	2	5	4	1	27 (63%)
	*PTI								2		2(5%)
Structured Traditional Classrooms	Yes	3	4	2	6	4	2	9	9	1	40 (93%)
	No								2	1	3 (7%)
	PTI										—
Flexible Scheduling	Yes		2	1	4	1		5	5		18 (42%
	No	3	2		2	3	2	5	5	1	23(53%)
	PTI			1				1			2(5%)
Differentiated Staffing	Yes		2	1	2			4	3		12(28%)
	No	3	2	1	4	4	2	7	7	1	31(72%)
	PTI										—
Team Teaching	Yes	3	3	1	2	2	2	8	9		30(70%)
	No		1	1	4	2		1	1	1	11(26%)
	PTI							2			2(5%)
Individualized Instruction (e.g., programmed instruction, contract systems, individual learning	Yes	3	4	2	5	4	2	10	9	1	40(93%)
	No				1				1		2(5%)
	PTI							1			1(2%)
PTA or Parent Club	Yes	3	4	2	5	4	1	11	10	1	41(95%)
	No				1		1				2(5%)
	PTI										—
Community or Parent Advisory Board	Yes	2	3	2	4	2	2	9	6	1	31(72%)
	No	1			2	2		1	4		10(23%)
	PTI		1					1			2(5%)

*PTI= plan to implement

Cont'd

Table 22 (Cont'd)

School Program/Organizational Arrangements
for School Location Within School Level

Program/ Organizational Arrangement	Response	Principals Indicating Yes, No, or Plan to Implement									Total
		Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
		Urban	Sub.	Rural	Urban	Sub.	Rural	Urban	Sub.	Rural	
Multi - age Pupil Groupings	Yes	3	3	1	5	4	2	5	6	1	30 (70%)
	No		1	1	1			4	3		10(23%)
	*PTI							2	1		3(7%)
Non - Graded Classrooms	Yes	3	2	1	5	2	2	3	2		20(47%)
	No		2	1	1	2		7	8	1	22(51%)
	PTI							1			1(2%)
In-class Paraprofessionals	Yes	2	1	1	3	1	1	6	4	1	20(47%)
	No	1	3	1	3	3	1	5	6		23(53%)
	PTI										
Ethnic Studies Program	Yes	3	2		2	2	1	4	1		15(35%)
	No		2	2	4	2	1	7	6	1	25(58%)
	PTI								3		3(7%)
Gifted Student Program	Yes	3	3	2	6	4		9	8		35(81%)
	No		1				2	2	1		6(14%)
	PTI								1	1	2(5%)
Educably Mental Retarded Program	Yes	3	4		4	1	1	3	2		18(42%)
	No			2	2	3	1	8	8	1	25(58%)
	PTI										
Educationally Handicapped Program	Yes	3	4	2	6	4	2	5	7	1	34(79%)
	No							6	3		9(21%)
	PTI										
School Within a School Program	Yes		2		1	1		2	1		7(16%)
	No	2	2	2	5	3	2	9	7	1	33(77%)
	PTI	1							2		3(7%)
*PTI = Plan to implement	N =	3 (7%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	11 (26%)	10 (23%)	1 (2%)	43 (100%)

Ninety-five percent of all schools have a PTA or parent club, and 72% have a community or parent advisory board. A majority of all schools also have a program for gifted students (81%) and a program for the educationally handicapped (79%).

Interestingly, without regard to level or location, programs for the educably mentally retarded do not exist in 58% of the schools. No rural senior high or elementary schools have these programs. Nor do a majority of elementary urban schools (73%) and suburban schools (80%), and intermediate suburban schools (75%). Only urban and suburban senior high schools and a majority of urban intermediate schools (67%) have such programs.

Although several schools have ethnic studies programs (35%), the majority do not (58%), nor do they plan to implement them. In fact, few schools plan to implement programs or structural arrangements not currently found in their schools.

No significant differences emerge from school level or location comparisons on school programs. In the main, the schools in this study are fairly traditional in relationship to the dimensions examined here. The principal's efforts to bring about change or innovations in a broader sense will be examined in a later section of this study.

The Task of the Principal

A conceptual framework for specifying the task of the principal was developed in the second section of this study. The conceptual scheme postulated consists of the following major broad categories along with their sub-sections.

I. School Management

Managing the school office
Coordinating the work of the school secretary
Planning and preparing school budget
Managing budget for special state or federal programs
Preparing requested school reports
Preparing school class schedule
Supervising the school cafeteria
Supervising bus loading
Supervising the school grounds
Monitoring special state or federal programs
Becoming familiar with guidelines for special state or federal programs

II. Educational Leadership

Supervising and evaluating school staff
Preparing proposals for funding
Developing or revising school policies or procedures
Developing new educational programs and projects
Planning and conducting staff in-service programs
Training staff for special state or federal programs
Conducting faculty meetings
Evaluating special state or federal programs
Evaluating general school programs

III. Teacher and Staff Personnel

Meeting with teachers individually and in groups
Teaching or covering classes for teachers
Mediating teacher or staff personnel problems or concerns

IV. Student Personnel

Meeting with students individually and in groups
Handling student discipline
Caring for health needs of students

V. Parent and Community Relations

Meeting with individual parents
Meeting with parent groups (PTA, parent clubs, etc.)
Meeting with school community groups
Participating in school community activities
Working with school community groups
Developing and establishing school public relations
Ensuring community involvement

Using this conceptual scheme for each of the 33 explanatory items (sub-sections of the broad conceptual categories), principals were asked to supply estimates of the time they spent and desired to spend performing them. Determination of the actual time principals spent performing the selected activities provides an indication of the duties and responsibilities which constitute their present task. By determining how principals desired to spend their time, we have gained an indication of the principals' perception of their task. That is, time desired reflects what principals think they ought to be doing, and thus what they think the essential task of the principal is.

Principals were asked to provide estimates of time spent and desired for each of the 33 items by checking the following response set: "not applicable," "none," "less than two hours," "two to five hours," "more than five hours." Differences between the percentages of principals indicating time spent and desired to spend performing various duties and responsibilities were examined for statistical significance at the .05 level.[63] The total responses of the principals are displayed in Table B-1, Appendix B, pp. 151-159.

The tasks that a majority of principals spent or desired to spend the largest amount of time (two to more than five hours per week) performing are listed under the major categories of the conceptual scheme postulated as follows:

Tasks - Two to Five Plus Hours Per Week	†Percentage of Principals Reporting: Time Spent	Time Desired to Spend
A. School Manager		
††11. Managing the school office	75%	61%
14. Preparing required school reports	68%	29%*
18. Supervising the school yard	54%	37%
B. Educational Leader		
12. Supervising and evaluating staff	78%	86%
21. Evaluating school programs	59%	90%*
25. Developing new educational programs and projects	37%	71%*
26. Planning and conducting staff in-service programs	27%	66%
C. Teacher and Staff Personnel		
1. Meeting with teachers individually and in groups	92%	97%
D. Student Personnel		
3. Meeting with students individually and in groups	61%	90%*
4. Handling student discipline	56%	17%*
E. Parent and Community Relations		
6. Meeting with individual parents	61%	61%
7. Meeting with parent groups	53%	48%
9. Participating in school community activities	47%	56%
20. Developing and establishing school public relations	51%	66%

Tasks which most principals indicate they do not spend or desire to spend time performing are:

Tasks - Not Performed	No Time Spent	Desired Not to Spend Time
A. School Manager		
16. Supervising school cafeteria	41%	51%
17. Supervising bus loading	57%	74%

† Percentages represent the principals indicating they actually spend or desire to spend the amount of time indicated based on N = 43.

†† These numbers refer to questionnaire item number.

* Differences between actual and desired percentages are significant at the 5% level.

Tasks - Not Performed (cont'd)	No Time Spent	Desired Not to Spend Time
28. Monitoring special state or federal programs	58%	63%
31. Managing budget for special state or federal programs	69%	71%
32. Becoming familiar with guidelines for special state or federal programs	56%	61%
B. Educational Leader		
29. Evaluating special state or federal programs	59%	61%
30. Training staff for special state or federal programs	70%	73%

Tasks which most principals report they spend, or which they desire to spend, less that two hours per week, are listed below:

Tasks - Less Than Two Hours Per Week	Time Spent	Time Desired to Spend
A. School Manager		
19. Coordinating work with school secretary	49%	63%
22. Planning and preparing school budget	78%	63%
B. Educational Leader		
23. Preparing proposals for funding	51%	49%
24. Developing or revising school policies and procedures	78%	59%
27. Conducting faculty meetings	76%	83%
C. Teacher and Staff Personnel		
2. Teaching or covering classes for teachers	59%	37%
13. Mediating staff personnel problems or concerns	73%	56%
D. Student Personnel		
5. Caring for health needs of students	66%	46%
E. Parent and Community Relations		
8. Meeting with school-community groups	56%	34%
10. Working with school-community groups	51%	46%
33. Ensuring community involvement	51%	32%

Summarizing the foregoing data, we find that principals spend a major portion of their time meeting with teachers, students, and parents, managing the school office, preparing required school reports and supervising and evaluating teachers. Thus, the duties and responsibilities demanding the greatest amount of time require that the principals have finely-honed interpersonal skills to deal sensitively with the problems and concerns of teachers, students, and parents; that skills in school and program management be well developed; and that the tools of supervision and evaluation be well understood for purposes of improving the performance of the school.

Principals see their task primarily as that of educator, specifically an educational leader concerned with improving the performance of the school. Principals would like to spend more time supervising and evaluating staff*, planning and conducting in-service programs for staff, developing new educational programs and projects*, evaluating programs*, meeting with students*, meeting with teachers, and developing and establishing school public relations, although they currently spend about three hours per week on each of these activities.

Conversely, principals resist their roles as managers. They would like to spend less time than the approximately three hours per week they now spend managing the office, preparing reports*, dealing with student discipline*, and supervising the school yard. Principals would also like to spend less time on the following activities (although they now consume less than two hours per week of their time): coordinating work with the school secretary, preparing proposals for funding, developing or revising school policies, teaching and covering classes for teachers, mediating staff

*Statistical significant differences in time spent and desired to spend at the 5% level.

problems, caring for student health needs, meeting and working with school-community groups, and ensuring community involvement. Most principals do not, and desire not to, spend time supervising bus loading and being involved with special state or federal programs.

Urban, suburban and rural principals, within and between each school level, manifest little variability in the amount of time spent and desired to spend performing the duties and responsibilities examined here. We find little justification for separating the task of the principal by school level or location.

Other Characteristics of Principals

In this section we report our findings on: principals' career aspirations; job satisfaction; influence in school decisions; the kinds of changes they implemented in their schools, and how pre- and in-service preparation programs were helpful in that regard; and, their financial compensation.

Career Aspirations. What are the career aspirations of principals? Do they desire to remain in their present position, or to move into other positions in or out of education? We asked principals to indicate the desirability of several career alternatives by checking "Very interested," "Have thought about seriously," "Undecided," "Not interested," or "Not applicable." The responses "Very interested" and "Have thought about seriously" on the check list are reported here, as very few "Not applicable" and "Undecided" responses were recorded. Thus, the two responses reported provide a fairly accurate view of principals' feelings. If "Very interested" or "Have thought about seriously" was not checked, principals were generally

not interested in the career item. All responses are displayed in Table 23.

Of the total responding sample of 42 principals, the majority (57%) indicate that they desire to remain principals of their present schools for the next five years. The remaining principals (43%), who did not respond positively, apparently have other aspirations. Do these principals desire to become administrators of more prestigious schools within the next five years? We note that only 21% of them (located primarily in rural intermediate, and urban and suburban elementary schools) indicate they are very interested in or have seriously thought about doing so. Evidently, among the principals who have no desire to remain in their present positions, many wish to move into careers outside of the principalship. To test this assumption, we attempted to determine the interest principals may have in other career choices.

Of the total sample, 31% of the principals indicate they are very interested in or have seriously thought about becoming college or university professors; 26% of the principals express a desire to become district or central office administrators; 26% of them indicate an interest in assuming an administrative or consultative position with a state education agency; 24% are interested in becoming full-time members of private consulting firms; and 24% report an interest in pursuing a career outside of education. Few principals indicate a strong interest in other career choices, such as earning a doctoral degree (19%), assuming an administrative or consultative position with a federal education agency (14%), assuming an administrative position with a professional school administrator organization (14%), becoming a college-university administrator (14%), entering into the political arena as a full-time educational lobbyist (10%), or earning another administrative credential

Table 23

Career Aspirations of Principals

Career Activities in which Principals either are "Very interested" or "have thought" about seriously	School Level and Location									
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			Total
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Remain principal of this school for at least 5 yrs.	2 (67%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	4 (67%)	3 (75%)	1 (50%)	6 (55%)	4 (44%)	1 (100%)	24 (57%)
Within the next 5 yrs. become principal of a more prestigious-- Elementary School						1	2	3		5 (12%)
Intermediate School						1	2			3 (7%)
Senior High School	1									1 (2%)
Earn a Ph.D. or Ed.D. Degree							2			2 (5%)
Earn another administrative credential			2	1	1		3	1		8 (19%)
Become a district/central office administrator	2	1	2	1	2	1	2			11 (26%)
Become a school superintendent		1	2	1	1	2	1	1		9 (21%)
Become a college/ university administrator		1	2		1	1	1			6 (14%)

Cont'd

Table 23 (Cont'd)

Career Aspirations of Principals

Career activities in which principals either are "very interested" or "have thought about seriously	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Become a college/ university professor	1	1		2	1	2	3	3		13 (31%)
Become a full-time member of a private consulting firm	2	1		2		1	3	1		10 (24%)
Assume an administrative or consultant position with a state education agency	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	2		11 (26)
Assume an administrative or consultant position with a federal education agency					1	1	2	2		6 (14%)
Assume an administrative position with a professional school administration organization	2	1			1	1	1			6 (14%)
Enter into the political arena as a full-time educational lobbyist			1		1		2			4 (10%)

Cont'd

Table 23 (Cont'd)

Career Aspirations of Principals

Career activities in which principals either are "very interested" or "have thought about seriously"	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Pursue a career outside education		1		1	1	2	3	2		10 (24%)
Other (Write in) Self-owned educational consulting firm							1			1 (2%)
Education writing-publication				1						1 (2%)
No Response								1		1 (2%)
N =	3 (7%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)	11 (26%)	9 (21%)	1 (2%)	42 (100%)

Percentages do not total 100% due to multiple responses.

(5%). Other career choices included educational writing and publishing and a self-owned educational consulting firm.

The reasons for only 57% of the principals desiring to remain in their present positions are not clear from our data. We may speculate that principals might be frustrated in their present positions because of the demands of the job and the inadequacy of time available to provide the educational leadership desired; or perhaps they view the principalship as a stepping stone to other career options. There is little doubt that the progression to other administrative positions, both in and out of school districts, is frequently through the principalship. It is not totally unexpected, therefore, that principals would indicate a desire to move into other positions related to their experiences. However, the desire to move to other types of positions may also reflect disenchantment with the principalship. To the extent that this is true, a modification of the principalship as it is presently conceived may be called for.

Job Satisfaction. Career aspiration is related to job satisfaction. Principals who desire to leave their present positions may wish to because of dissatisfaction. In examining career aspirations in the preceding section, we found that many principals desired not to remain in their present positions for the next five years. While the earlier-mentioned speculative reasons may help to explain this finding, we examined the additional related area of job satisfaction.

Using a list of school-related items thought to be important to overall job satisfaction, we asked principals to indicate whether they were "Satisfied" or "Dissatisfied" with them, or "Neither." The items were: parent involvement; community relations; teacher cooperation; student

Table 24

Job Satisfaction of Principals

Principal satisfaction with each of following	Response	School Level and Location									Total
		Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
		Urban	Sub.	Rural	Urban	Sub.	Rural	Urban	Sub.	Rural	
Parent Involvement	Satisfied	1	2		4	2	1	6	5		21 (50%)
	Dissatis.	2	1	1	2	2	1	3	3		15 (36%)
	Neither		1	1				2	1	1	6 (14%)
Community Relations	Satisfied		3		4	2	1	9	4		23 (55%)
	Dissatis.					1			2		5 (12%)
	Neither	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	3	1	14 (33%)
Teacher Cooperation	Satisfied		4	2	4	3	1	9	6	1	30 (71%)
	Dissatis.	1			1				1		3 (7%)
	Neither	2			1	1	1	2	2		9 (21%)
Student Academic Performance	Satisfied		2	2	3	1		3	5		16 (38%)
	Dissatis.	1	1		1		1		2		6 (14%)
	Neither	2	1		2	3	1	8	2	1	20 (49%)
Willingness of staff to attempt innovative programs	Satisfied		4	1	1	1	1	8	3	1	20 (49%)
	Dissatis.	2			1	1	1	1	1		7 (17%)
	Neither	1		1	4	2		2	5		15 (36%)
District Office Support	Satisfied	1	2	1	3	3		5	3	1	19 (45%)
	Dissatis.	1		1	1		2	3	2		10 (24%)
	Neither	1	2		2	1		3	4		13 (31%)
Quality of teaching staff	Satisfied	1	3	1	3	4	2	7	5	1	27 (64%)
	Dissatis.	1			2			1	1		5 (12%)
	Neither	1	1	1	1			3	3		10 (24%)
Quality of non-teaching staff	Satisfied	2	4	2	4	3	2	8	6		31 (74%)
	Dissatis.	1			1					1	3 (7%)
	Neither				1	1		3	3		8 (19%)

Cont'd)

Table 24 (Cont'd)

Job Stratification of Principals

Principal satisfaction with with each of the following	Response	School Level and Location									Total
		Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
		Urban	Sub.	Rural	Urban	Sub.	Rural	Urban	Sub.	Rural	
Adequacy of school budget	Satisfied		2	2	1	1	1	2	2		11 (26%)
	Dissatis.	3			4	3	1	5	7		23 (55%)
	Neither		2		1			4		1	8 (19%)
Staff morale	Satisfied	1	3	2	4	2	1	7	5	1	26 (62%)
	Dissatis.	1									1 (2%)
	Neither	1	1		2	2	1	4	4		15 (36%)
School human relations program	Satisfied		1	2	1	2		7	3	1	17 (40%)
	Dissatis.	1			2	2	1	1	1		8 (19%)
	Neither	2	3		3		1	3	5		17 (40%)
No response									1		
N =		3 (7%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)	11 (26%)	9 (21%)	1 (2%)	42 (100%)

academic performance; willingness of the staff to attempt innovative programs; district office support; quality of teaching staff; quality of non-teaching staff; adequacy of school budget; staff morale; and school human relations program. Table 24 displays the responses to these items.

The only item with which a majority of principals (55%) indicated dissatisfaction is the adequacy of the school budget. By school level and location, all urban senior high school principals, 67% of the urban, 75% of the suburban, and 50% of the rural intermediate principals, and 45% of the urban and 78% of the suburban elementary principals indicate dissatisfaction in this area. This dissatisfaction with the school budget, expressed by 61% of the principals, is attributable to the impact of California Senate Bill 90, which restricts the amount of revenue school districts can raise through taxes.[64]

Irrespective of school level or location, many principals (36%) also report dissatisfaction with parent involvement in the school. The reasons most of these principals give for dissatisfaction in this area are: parent apathy, and parental working patterns which prevent their involvement in the school (particularly in the case of urban schools).

With no major distinction between school level or location, the majority of principals appear to be most satisfied with the quality of their teaching staffs, teacher cooperation and staff morale. Sixty-four percent, 71% and 62% of the principals report satisfaction on these items respectively.

Overall, the majority of principals are satisfied with their jobs in relation to the items examined here. Their only major dissatisfaction is wit the adequacy of the school budget.

Influence. It is generally assumed that the principal has considerable influence, if not complete authority, in the determination and execution of key school decisions. To examine whether that assumption is tenable, we asked principals to indicate on a scale from 1 (very much) to 8 (none) the amount of influence they had in regard to areas perceived to be of major importance for school management and leadership. These areas were: selecting school staff; determining school budget; allocating school resources; determining school programs; and determining school policies. The distribution of means and standard deviations for responses on influence are shown in Table 25.

No statistically significant differences were found between school levels or between school locations within school levels at the .05 level using the "t" test for pair-wise comparisons. Viewing principals in the aggregate, we find that they have considerable influence in all areas examined here, except that of determining the school budget. Obviously, the lack of influence in this area bears some relationship to school programs. Without the necessary budget, new or continuing innovative school programs may be limited. However, within the school budget, principals do have influence in determining how resources are allocated. The influence that principals report they have in the areas examined here gives credence to the view that schools can and do reflect the decisions of the principal. How that influence is used is a matter which we think bears importantly on principal effectiveness.

Changes Implemented in the Schools. As reported above, principals have considerable influence in determining school programs and policies. As a measure of one way in which that influence is exemplified, we asked principals

Table 25

Amount of Influence Principals Have Concerning Selected School Decisions

Selected School Decisions	School Level and Location																	
	Senior High						Intermediate						Elementary					
	Urban (N=3) (7%)		Suburban (N=4) (10%)		Rural (N=2) (5%)		Urban (N=6) (14%)		Suburban (N=4) (10%)		Rural (N=2) (5%)		Urban (N=11) (26%)		Suburban (N=9) (21%)		Rural (N=1) (2%)	
	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD	X	SD
Selecting School Staff	3.3	2.5	1	0	1.5	.71	2.7	1.5	1.8	.96	1	0	3	1.3	3.6	2.1	(1)	0
Determining School Budget	3.7	2.5	2.8	2.1	2.5	.71	5.8	2.1	4.5	2.9	4	4.2	4.8	1.8	5.2	2.6	(3)	0
Allocating School Resrcs.	3.3	1.5	2	1.2	2	0	2.2	.41	2.5	.71	2.5	.71	2.8	1.3	2.8	2	(3)	0
Determining School Programs	2	1	1.5	.58	2.5	.71	1.8	.75	2.8	1.5	2	1.4	2.4	1.2	3.1	1.8	(4)	
Determining School Policies	1.7	.58	1.5	.58	2	0	2.2	.98	3	1.8	1	0	2.5	1.3	2.3	.87	(5)	0
No Repsonse																1		

N = 42
(100%)

to indicate the most significant changes they had implemented in their schools during the past three years. In addition, we asked them to explain how their pre- or in-service preparation for the principalship had been of help to them in regard to the changes implemented.

The range of program changes implemented by principals is quite broad, but restricted primarily to instructional and organizational domains. Other program changes fall into the broad areas of student support, community and parental relations, and staff relations, but they are in the minority. Specific examples of changes implemented include the following: Instructional--individualized instruction, multiethnic programs, alternative programs, mathematics and reading labs, learning centers, and contract learning; Organizational--flexible scheduling, team teaching, non-graded classrooms, and multiage grouping; Student support--tutorial programs and after-school co-curricular programs; Community and parent relations--parent education and direct involvement in the school program; Staff relations--staff development program. No single broad category of changes implemented by principals can be identified exclusively with a particular school level or location. Nor are there specific changes that have been implemented by large numbers of principals. (See Table B-2, Appendix B, pp. 160-164.

The degree of involvement of staff and others in planning and implementing the changes reported here is not evident from the data. It is reasonable to assume, however, that for many of the changes implemented, considerable involvement was both desirable and necessary.

An attempt was made to determine how pre- and in-service preparation programs were helpful, if at all, in assisting principals to implement the

the changes they reported. The majority of the responding principals (66%) indicate that these programs were of little or no help. A few principals (23%) disclose that they were able to recognize the possibilities of innovations at in-service workshops. Still fewer indicate that in-service programs were helpful in planning but not implementing (13%). It is significant that none of the principals claim that pre-service programs were helpful in their efforts to bring about changes within the school. Table B-3, Appendix B, p. 165, shows how much principals felt that pre- and in-service preparation programs assisted them in bringing about changes within their schools during the past three years.

Financial Compensation. The final characteristic of principals which we will consider here is their financial compensation. The majority of principals (67%) earn between $22,000 and $26,999 per year based on 206 to 225 workdays. The median salary for all principals is $24,400, and the median number of workdays upon which the principal's salary is based is 207. Senior high urban and suburban principals are generally the highest paid, earning over $27,000 per year; and many elementary principals, lowest paid, earning from $17,000 to $21,999 per year (urban 22%, suburban 30%). Comparing principal salaries by school level and location, we find that at the elementary level the median yearly salary for urban principals is $23,950, for suburban principals, $23,650. At the senior high level, the median yearly salary is $28,250 for urban principals, and $29,500 suburban. At the intermediate level, urban and suburban principals cluster in the same salary range ($22,000 to $26,999). Rural principals are at the lower salary range at each school level--senior high, $22,000 to $26,999, intermediate and elementary, $17,000 to $21,999. (The distribution of principals' salaries and workdays is shown in Table 26.)

Table 26

Salary Range of Principals and
Number of Days Used to Determine

	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Salary Range										
$17,000 - $21,999						2	2	3	1	8 (19%)
$22,000 - $26,999	1	1	2	6	4		9	6		29 (67%)
$27,000 and Above	2	3						1		6 (14%)
Number of Days Salary Based On										
185 - 205				5	1		9	5		20 (47%)
206 - 225	3	3	1	1	3	1	1	3	1	17 (40%)
226 and Above		1	1			1	1	2		6 (14%)
N =	3 (7%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	6 (14%)	4 (9%)	2 (5%)	11 (26%)	10 (23%)	1 (2%)	43 (100%)

Principal salaries are associated with school size: generally, the larger the school, the greater the level of financial compensation. Salary level is also associated with school location; small rural schools provide the lowest financial compensation for principals at all school levels. Whether this condition is purely a function of size or wealth is not clear from our data.

The annual salaries of principals in this study far outstrip the average annual 1968-69 salaries of elementary school principals ($15,622), junior high principals ($16,136), and senior high principals ($17,569) in the nation's largest school districts.[65] Two factors may account for these conditions: first, salaries have generally increased for all school personnel throughout the nation, and second, salaries paid to principals and teachers in this region may be significantly higher than those paid in other sections of the country.

Chapter IV

Summary and Implications

This exploratory study has been concerned with examining 1) the task of the principal; 2) how pre- and in-service programs for principals might be enhanced; and 3) whether educational, experiential and professional characteristics of principals, and school characteristics as well, differed sufficiently by school level or location to justify the practice of dividing the study of the principalship into those latter dimensions. We were further interested in discovering whether selected principal characteristics were unique to a given school type, thereby providing an indirect gauge for a possible principal self-selection process.

The results of our examination of specific aspects of principals and schools, guided by the research questions formulated, were reported in the previous sections. We summarize the findings and their implications for each question here.

1. What are the personal, educational and experiential characterstics of principals based on school location and school level? Are these characteristics consistent with those reported in previous studies?

Urban, suburban and rural principals in this study had personal, educational and experiential characteristics that were quite similar. The typical principal was male, about 50 years old, grew up in an urban community, and attended public elementary and secondary schools, as well as public institutions of higher learning located primarily in California. He received his undergraduate training between the years 1946-55. (Elementary principals tended to major in education, intermediate principals in physical education, and senior high prinipals in the social sciences.) His graduate

training for the master's degree was completed during the years 1956-65; he majored in educational administration. The doctorate was held by only a few senior high and intermediate prinipals, and had been earned in educational administration during the years 1966-75. Rural school principals were more likely to have received the doctorate than others. Regardless of school level, specialized training for the principalship was not taken until graduate study.

Rural principals were signficantly younger than others. Half of the rural principals in this study were in their thirties and the other half in their forties, while more than half of the urban and suburban principals were at least fifty years old. It seems plausible that this disparity in age may reflect a high turnover rate among rural principals; the resultant vacancies then being filled by younger principals. Our data do indicate that rural principals are not only younger, but that they have been principals in their present schools for fewer years than urban and suburban principals. By school level, elementary principals are younger than urban and suburban principals.

The median number of years principals have been at their present schools is about four and one-half. Most urban and suburban principals, however, have been in education more than 20 years; the majority of rural principals, less than 20 years. For most principals, their present position is not their first principalship. All principals have had more than 12 years of teaching and administrative experience.

Principals indicated that their work experiences since graduation from college in professional and technical occupational fields outside of the education profession were of greater help to them in their present

position than were their educational experiences. Such non-educational experiences primarily business-related, helped them to develop their human relations and communication skills. The educational experience which they believed important, although to a lesser extent than non-educational ones, was the internship or field experience.

Clearly, there are more professional, educational and experiential similarities between elementary, intermediate and senior high principals than there are differences. Principals are generally men; they grew up, for the most part, in the same type of communities; they have had educational experiences in basically the same kinds of institutions, and have engaged in similar areas of academic study. Most of them have had considerable teaching and administrative experience. Career patterns for most principals show that they progressed from teacher to vice principal to principal. With overwhelming frequency, their teaching experience was obtained at the same grade level school as the school in which principals now serve. However, few similarities exist between the type of community in which principals grew up and the location of schools in which they currently hold principalships.

Although there is no conclusive evidence of superiority to support the nearly exclusive practice of appointing men to the principalship, the majority of school districts continue to do so. Our having found nearly all male principals corroborates the results of earlier studies conducted under the auspices of the Department of Elementary School Principals,[66] Hemphill, Richards and Peterson,[67] and Becker, _et al._[68] However, on several important levels, women principals have been found to be more outstanding than men: those of verbal fluency, involvement of others in the decision

making process, and maintaining organizational relationships.[69] The reasons for the underrepresentation of women principals is not readily apparent from our findings. The very few women principals in this study were located primarily in elementary schools. This is obviously an area for continuing investigation.

School districts continue to appoint to the principalship those persons who have followed the traditional pattern of spending considerable time first as a teacher, then as a vice principal or as some other administrator in a post below that of a principal (e.g., counselor). This practice prevails in spite of the fact that the amount of teaching and administrative experience prior to the principalship has been found to be negatively-related to administrative effectiveness.[70] The traditional practice of primarily appointing men with considerable experience to the principalship limits the availability pool, and may prevent schools from obtaining the most able, creative and innovative individuals for that position.

In the main, our findings concerning personal, educational and experiential characteristics, are consistent with those of other studies. On the basis of our evidence, we find few reasons to recommend the continued practice of separating the study of principals by school level or location. Our findings, in juxtaposition with the results of other studies, do suggest that two areas require continuing investigation: the underrepresentation of women principals and the establishment of more effective criteria for the selection of principals.

2. <u>What are the characteristics of schools in which principals serve based on school level and location?</u>

Typically, schools at each grade level follow traditional grade organizational patterns. Elementary schools have grades K-6, intermediate

schools grades 7-9, and high schools grades 10-12. Senior high schools have the largest teaching staffs (50 to 100) and elementary schools the smallest (1 to 25). Intermediate schools have teaching staffs of 25 to 49. Non-teaching staff common to all schools includes a variety of positions: clerical and custodial employees, instructional aides, librarians, nurses and school psychologists. Other non-teaching staff, such as vice principals, deans and counselors, are found almost exclusively in intermediate and senior high schools. Instructional and community aides are more prevalent in elementary schools.

Student enrollments vary by school level: urban and suburban high schools typically have about 1,600 students, intermediate schools about 800 students. Elementary schools and rural schools regardless of level have about 400 students. Schools differ in terms of student ethnic composition, with larger percentages of minority students found in urban elementary schools. The percentage of minority students declines with each higher school grade level. A majority of the students at each school type generally come from families with incomes between $8,000 and $13,999.

In regard to programmatic structure, a majority of schools have structured traditional classrooms, team teaching, individualized instruction, multiage grouping, a PTA or parent club, a gifted students program, and programs for the educable mentally retarded. Very few schools have programs for the trainable mentally retarded. Generally, programs for the mentally retarded are found in intermediate and high schools. Few schools have differentiated staffing and ethnic studies programs, and still fewer have school-within-a-school programs.

The schools in this study are fairly traditional in size and structure. Senior high school principals have responsibility for larger staffs and student enrollments; elementary school and rural school principals have smaller staffs and enrollments. Most schools have many of the same programs. We find no school program that is uniquely and exclusively associated with any one school level, although very few EMR or TMR programs exist in elementary schools. Urban schools have a better ethnic mix of students than rural or suburban ones, and thus provide potentially interesting laboratories for developing an appreciation and understanding of ethnic group diversity.

While senior high school principals have a broader scope of responsibility for school programs than do other principals as examined in this study, all schools share many of the same basic programs. Obviously, student age, maturity and diversity must be accommodated, and this suggests programmatic variations for each school level and location. Nevertheless, the basic strategy and objectives of most programmatic and structural arrangements remain the same at each school level. The similarities and dissimilarities are basically those of size and intensity, rather than of substance.

3. What is the task of the principal? To what extent does that task vary by school level and location?

In examining this question, we formulated a conceptual framework to encompass the duties and responsibilities of the principal which consisted of the following broad categories: school management; educational leadership; teacher and staff personnel; student personnel; and parent and

community relations. For each major area, subsections were used to specify its intent. The resulting 33 subsections became the basis for inquiry in this area. Principals were asked to indicate the amount of time they spent and the amount of time they desired to spend during a typical work week performing these activities. By contrasting how principals spent their time and how they desired to spend it, we acquired a measure of what they perceive to be the important segments of their task.

The typical principal in this study is concerned more with educational leadership than with school management. He is also interested in meeting with teachers, students and parents. While he spends considerable time engaged in performing educational leadership activities each week, he desires to spend more; but the crush of many other time-consuming activities prevents him from doing so.

The activities which now occupy the most time per week for a majority of principals, irrespective of school level or location, are listed below (according to the categories of the conceptual scheme used in this study).

A. School Manager

- Managing the school office
- Preparing required school reports
- Supervising the school yard

B. Educational Leader

- Supervising and evaluating staff
- Evaluating school programs

C. Teacher and Staff Personnel

- Meeting with teachers individually and in groups

D. Student Personnel

- Meeting with students individually and in groups
- Handling student discipline

E. Parent and Community Relations

- Meeting with parent groups
- Meeting with individual parents
- Developing and establishing school public relations

Those activities which a majority of principals would like to spend the most time performing (or more time than they already spend, even though that activity may now command a major block of their time) are:

A. School Manager

- None

B. Educational Leader

- Supervising and evaluating staff
- Evaluating school programs
- Developing new educational programs and projects
- Planning and conducting staff in-service programs

C. Teacher and Staff Personnel

- Meeting with teachers individually and in groups

D. Student Personnel

- Meeting with students individually and in groups

E. Parent and Community Relations

- Meeting with individual parents
- Developing and establishing school public relations
- Participating in school community activities

Activities which a majority of principals indicate demand large portions of their time, but which they desire to spend less time performing, are:

A. School Manager

- Managing the school office
- Preparing required school reports
- Supervising the school yard

B. Educational Leader

- None

C. Teacher and Staff Personnel

- None

D. Student Personnel

- Handling student discipline

E. Parent and Community Relations

- Meeting with parent groups

From the above lists of activities which now consume (or would desirably consume) a major portion of the principals' time each week, it is obvious that they view their task as that of educational leader, as opposed to school manager. This conclusion is further supported when we consider those activities on which a majority of principals desire to spend less than the present two hours or less per week. These activities are: School Manager--planning and preparing the school budget. Educational Leader--developing or revising school policies and procedures. Teacher and Staff Personnel--mediating staff personnel problems or concerns.

The duties and responsibilities of the principal are numerous and time consuming. For example, using the foregoing lists of activities which occupy the principal's time each week, we can provide a rough measure of the minimum amount of time they spend performing them. By assigning three and one-half hours per week to each of the eleven items that now consume the major portion of their time (two to five hours per week), and one hour per week to each of the ten activities that now consume less than two hours per week, we find that these combined activities alone represent

48.5 hours of the principals' work week. Adding seven and one-half hours per week for preparation (1.5 hours per day) and five hours per week for unexpected activities, we have a total of 61 hours per week or approximately 12 hours per day based on the five-day school week. Obviously, many principals will have a longer work week. Given the fact that the typical school day is approximately six hours, the amount of time principals may engage in educational leadership activities, such as supervising and evaluating staff, is severely restricted. Therefore, it is questionable whether principals can perform adequately as both educational leaders and school managers, although both functions are important for effective and efficient schools.

If we are to enable principals to function in an outstanding manner both as educational leaders and as school managers, then we must begin to find ways to provide better opportunities for them to do so. One solution to this problem is the creation of co-principalships.

Operationally, in large schools (student enrollment of 1,000 and above), we propose that two principals -- co-principals -- be assigned: one to be responsible for the managerial tasks of the school, and the other for the tasks designated as educational leadership. Other tasks which do not fall exclusively into either category (e.g., teacher or student personnel and parent community relations) would be shared by the co-principals. Decision making in the co-principalship would be shared, and would involve teachers, students, parents, and alumni. For small schools, co-principals might exist for two or three schools combined, depending on their size and proximity.

Given the tasks of principals and the great amount of time required to perform them, the co-principal arrangement holds promise as a more realistic approach to the principalship. Furthermore, the co-principalship

recognizes the importance of both educational leadership and school managerial roles. Hence, this concept does not relegate one or the other function to a lesser status office, such as that of a vice principal, dean, or special assistant. In some respects, the co-principal concept is similar to Bales' dual leadership concept, involving informal and formal leaders as postulated for schools by Williams. Adopting Bales' concept, Williams holds that schools need a "social" or informal leader to provide considerate treatment and to keep the work group unified, and a "task" or formal leader--the actual principal--to keep the group engaged in work.[71] By contrast, the co-principal concept as advocated here, views both leaders as formal; each performing "task" and "social" roles. By providing co-principals for each large school and a combination of small ones, the division of work is envisioned as 1) being more realistic in terms of time restrictions and scope of expertise; 2) providing the opportunity for each co-principal to concentrate his efforts and skills; and 3) providing for greater accountability for administrators and staff.

It is clear that the conceptual framework developed to examine the task of the principal is not without merit. The items used to denote each conceptual category must, of course, be refined and made more precise. For instance, principals indicate that several activities included in the conceptual scheme do not occupy their time, nor do they desire them to do so. These activities are primarily those which deal with special state and federal programs. Given the plethora of special federal and state programs, we assumed that principals would be required to become actively involved with such programs. Apparently, this has not been the case, or else few such programs existed in the school included in this study. This area of

activities needs to be examined closely to determine whether principals are involved in federal and state programs in ways not specified in the conceptual framework used here.

The method of recording the amount of time principals spend engaged in performing various activities must also be refined. We were concerned here with determining the task of the principal as it is and as principals felt it should be. Differences were observed between actual and desired time dimensions, based on estimates by the principals. Whether these estimates represent a psychological view of time, in which estimates are based on perceptions of psychological involvement rather than on actual time spent is not known. It is clear, however, that principals do desire to spend more time performing tasks that fall into the category of educational leadership. The obstacles that curtail this leadership function appear to be associated with the time principals actually spend on other tasks. If the principal is to exercise the kind of educational leadership that is appropriate to his task, in addition to performing as a school manager, then we must find ways to free him to do so. The co-principal concept holds promise in this regard.

4. What are the career aspirations of principals? Do they vary by school level and location?

While the majority of principals desire to remain principals of their present schools for the next five years, approximately one-fourth of them (particularly in urban and suburban elementary and rural intermediate schools) indicate a desire to move into principalships at more prestigious schools. The career aspirations of the principals who desire not to remain

in the principalship include college and university teaching, school district or central office administration, state education agency administration, educational consulting, and careers outside of education.

The reasons principals desire not to remain in the principalship are not conclusive from our data. We might speculate that some principals may be disenchanted or frustrated with their positions. Alternatively, some may simply feel that their talents are better suited for other positions, or that other positions may not be quite as demanding. But to the extent that the desire to move out of the principalship is associated with inadequate time to perform the duties of the position, our argument for the reorganization of the principalship is strengthened.

5. Are principals satisfied in their jobs? Do variations exist because of school level and location?

In the areas of job satisfaction examined--that is, parent involvement, community relations, teacher cooperation, student academic performance, willingness of staff to attempt innovative programs, district office support, quality of the teaching staff, quality of the non-teaching staff, adequacy of the school budget, staff morale, and school human relations program--principals are satisfied in their jobs. The only job-related activity with which a majority of principals expressed dissatisfaction was the inadequacy of the school budget. Several principals indicate that this is attributable to California Senate Bill 90, which restricts the amount of revenue school districts can raise through local taxes. The only other area of dissatisfaction was that of parent involvement. The lack of parental involvement is thought to be associated with parental apathy and, primarily

in the case of urban schools, parental working patterns, which conflict with school hours. No other differences were found for job satisfaction between principals on the basis of school level or location.

It must be noted that the findings on job satisfaction here do not reflect a measure of intensity. It is likely that differences in the feelings of principals would emerge if the strength of their satisfaction was to be examined. Nevertheless, principals are obviously satisfied with many aspects associated with their jobs. Although according to our earlier finding, several principals desire not to remain at their present schools, their reasons for desiring to move may be more closely associated with occupational mobility than job dissatisfaction (as the latter term is employed here).

6. How much influence do principals have in affecting major administrative decisions in their schools? Does the amount of influence vary by school level and location?

Principals have considerable influence in selecting school staff, determining school programs and policies, and allocating school resources. Importantly, they lack influence in determining the school budget, which may restrict them from developing and providing special resources for new programs. However, if principals were given the task of determining, say, a program budget and administering it, then their already-demanding duties and responsibilities would be increased. Assuming that budget preparation and administration would be a high priority task, principals would be further removed from the desirable task of educational leadership.

The determination and management of the school budget is an important leadership task. If it is to be accomplished effectively, it must receive

attention and care. The co-principalship is a potentially efficient arrangement in this regard.

Those areas in which principals do have considerable influence reinforce the view that the school reflects the skill, knowledge, vision and creativity of the principal. Thus, the manner in which influence is used should be a major consideration in assessing principal effectiveness, and is an area for continuing study.

7. Is the principal a change agent? Has pre- and in-service training helped him to institute change?

The principal as a change agent is a concept closely linked to the influence he has. Clearly, adequate influence in determining school programs and allocating resources are requisites for school change. In these dimensions, principals fare well. However, according to principals, limitations to school change are imposed by inadequate budgets and the principals' own lack of influence in determining the overall school financial school allocation.

A further limitation to change is suggested by Mitchell, who uses Merton's view of local and cosmopolitan influentials to argue that change within the school is impeded by the local orientation of principals. Mitchell holds that principals exhibit a tendency not to "rock the boat," to maintain the status quo.[72]

Neither of the factors suggested above as limiting or restricting change were evident from our data. Principals had implemented a broad range of organizational and instructional changes within their schools. No particular change, however, could be identified with a large number of principals.

Interestingly enough, no principal indicated that his pre-service training had been helpful to him in planning or implementing change. On the other hand, a few principals did find in-service programs to be instrumental in helping them to recognize not only the potential of school innovations and change, but also to plan and implement change. Evidently pre-service preparation programs fail to emphasize the value and the process of change--important dimensions that we believe should receive serious consideration in preparation programs.

8. How do principals view the usefulness of formal pre-service university courses for the principalship?

The one pre-service university course that the majority of principals found very useful is the internship. Other courses which they consider very useful, but to a lesser degree, are education and the law, general school administration, and school finance. Differential views are noted; elementary and intermediate principals cast their vote for the internship, while senior high principals tended to view general school administration as very helpful. The bulk of university pre-service courses, however, are seen as somewhat useful. Few principals indicate that pre-service courses are not useful.

A majority of principals report either that teacher negotiations were not offered, or that they did not take such course during their pre-service preparation. Additionally, many principals indicate that the internship and personnel management were also courses not offered during their training. These latter courses are, of course, fairly recent additions as requirements or options for principal preparation program curricula.

The majority of principals found their pre-service course work to be of some value. However, principals make numerous suggestions on how pre-service programs could be improved. The most frequent comments support greater emphasis on on-the-job training or internship programs, more practical orientation of many pre-service courses, and the inclusion of workshops dealing with time management. Principals feel that there is merit in using on-site courses in which practical, realistic school occurrences become a focal point for preparation.

More specifically, principals indicate that pre-service courses should provide greater emphasis on: staff development; supervision and evaluation; curriculum development and assessment; organizational development, including human or interpersonal relations, communication skills, time management, and program evaluation; and parent and community involvement. Many of these areas are presently required pre-service competency requirements for principals in training.[73] Whether these pre-service courses as currently taught fulfill the needs of principals has yet to be adequately determined.

It is significant that principals do not find pre-service courses to be of value in assisting them to plan and implement change. To the degree that change is desirable in schools, pre-service preparation courses should begin to equip principals with techniques for planning and implementing change.

9. How do principals view the usefulness of in-service programs?

The majority of principals reported that in-service programs are very useful. Elementary principals tended to participate in programs in

the humanistic area; senior high principals, in programs with a management focus. Intermediate and elementary principals tended to participate in programs dealing with general school administration, more so than senior high principals.

Principals found in-service programs most useful when they were practical rather than theoretical. They stressed the value of on-site inspection of innovative programs, as well as the importance of learning techniques for problem solving. One principal summarized many others' feelings with the following statement: "Interaction with other school staff and visiting a wide variety of programs have been my most valued activities." In addition, principals give strong support to the development of new programs stressing field experiences rather than traditional course work.

The major sponsors of in-service programs are, first, school districts, and second, the Association of California School Administrators. Colleges and universities, the State Department of Education, and various private organizations contribute little in this area.

It is interesting that few in-service programs are sponsored by colleges or universities. Although the argument can be made that the role of colleges and universities in preparing school principals should be focused at the pre-service level, it seems equally convincing to argue that in-service programs should constitute an important aspect of continuing education. Schools and departments of education in colleges and universities are professional in nature. Professors who teach in them should establish a close relationship to the field, and should assist principals to strengthen areas of weakness or need where possible. Further, given the relatively small number

of positions available for new principals (estimated to be 8% of present positions per year[74]) present school principals must be considered in any attempts to improve the principalship. Colleges and universities could establish such programs during the summer months based on need, and periodically during the academic year on weekends.

10. What do principals view as resources that would help them to be more effective?

The feelings of many principals concerning help they need to be more effective are reflected in the following statements:

> In a nutshell--"More help." Your prefacing letter said it all. Today's principal has too much to do. One person can't do it. So you compromise and consequently get caught short.

> I've felt I knew how to be an effective administrator for the last 10 years of my 18 years of administrative experience. I'm feeling more and more impotent each year because of (1) teacher militancy and less and less willingness to volunteer for anything; (2) no assistance--vice principal or otherwise--in counseling or disciplining students; (3) more and more parent interference with administrative decisions.

A second principal states--

> Most of the problems I face are people-related problems. Children come from homes where there are enormous problems. We are faced with problems of congestion, survival at home and school, and varying value systems. Teachers and staff are faced with enormous problems trying to work within these forces.

> Teachers, administrators, parents, communities need time for various ways to communicate and work out common problems.

A third principal states--

> First, administrative and clerical assistance. An educational family counselor or planner to work with families in trouble (this consumes much of my time). Ann Landers does an excellent job of sending divorced mothers of two or three to my office constantly seeking avenues of help. I, too,

> need to have more training in how other agencies can help me with these problems. I'm learning by experience. Social services, protective services, and the probation department are now common daily relationships.
>
> Second, time management--how to cope with calls for help from families, teachers and students from 7:30 A.M. until 5:30 to 6 P.M. every day. It is impossible to close the door to do paper work without leaving frustrated teachers or parents, etc., outside. Consequently, most paper work is done at night or on weekends. . . .

Principals are faced with the problem of attempting to do many things within inadequate time periods. As a consequence, most principals, regardless of school level or location, indicate that they need help in managing time and that they need additional staff. They also express a need to increase their abilities in the areas of staff development and evaluation, and for better professional training in areas such as interpersonal skills, group dynamics and social services (see Table 27).

While increasing the skills of principals in the above areas is important, ensuring that time will be available to employ those skills is essential. The job of the principal is a demanding one. Principals recognize this, and feel that they need to better manage their time and prioritize tasks. From our earlier analysis of the principal's task, together with the kinds of help principals feel they need, the concept of co-principals is further reinforced. The co-principalship provides one solution to the alleviation of frustrations caused by the lack of time individual principals now experience. The reduction of further frustrations must be addressed through more effective pre- and in-service programs.

Table 27

Help Principals Need to become More Effective

Help Needed	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Time Management	2	1		4	1		4	2	1	16 (44%)
Techniques in staff development & evaluation	1		1			1	1	1	1	6 (17%)
Better & larger administrative support staff	2				1		2	2		7 (19%)
Better professional training		1	1	1		2		1		6 (17%)
Better staff-student ratio	2									2 (6%)
Better district support		1			1					2 (6%)
Inservice focused on educational issues		1		1			1		1	4 (11%)
Control of Budget				1			1	1		3 (8%)
Curriculum Development							1	2	1	4 (11%)
Autonomy & Authority						1	1			2 (6%)
Less political interference						1		1		2 (6%)
Miscellaneous	1					1		2	1	5 (14%)
No response	1	1			2	1	2	2		7 (19%)
N =	2 (6%)	3 (8%)	2 (6%)	6 (17%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	11 (31%)	8 (22%)	1 (3%)	36 (100%)

*Percentages do not total 100% due to multiple responses.

Concluding Remarks

In order to examine the task of the principal, a new conceptual framework was introduced. Within this framework, the task of the principal is seen as consisting of the following major areas: school management; educational leadership; teacher and staff personnel; student personnel; and parent and community relations. Each major area is defined by subsections, items specifying the role activities of the principal.

It is clear that principals engage in a myriad of duties and responsibilities. They desire, however, to spend more time in the role of educational leader than in the role of school manager. They also desire to spend more time meeting with students and parents than they presently do. But because of the demands of the total range of their duties and responsibilities, the opportunity to engage in educational leadership activities (e.g., supervising and evaluating staff, evaluating school programs, developing new educational programs and projects) is restricted.

It is desirable to have principals spend a greater amount of time engaged in educational leadership activities. Educational leadership is a requisite for school improvement and growth. To the extent that their present duties and responsibilities prevent principals from engaging in activities that can be classified as educational leadership, school improvement is hampered.

One approach to ameliorating the problem of limited time availability for educational leadership activities is that of the co-principalship. This concept must, of course, be refined, and will hopefully be tested. Its magic premise is that the task of the principal is too broad in scope for

individual principals to be expected to perform at the level of excellence necessary for school growth and a high level of school effectiveness. Thus, the co-principalship envisions one individual serving as an educational leader and one as a school manager, both with overlapping responsibilities for school-community relations, student and staff relations, and budgeting. Decision making would be shared, and would involve students, staff, parents, and alumni.

Principals are both managers and leaders; but the leadership dimension of their task, particularly in large schools, suffers from the lack of available time and, we suspect, the stress of the job. The co-principalship provides one solution to this problem.

Focusing our attention on another area, we find that the practice of isolating elementary, intermediate or senior high schools for the study of principals is not justified by our study. In examining the task of the principal, we find little distinction between school level or geographical location for the amount of time principals engage in, or desire to engage in, the role activities examined. In addition, the similarities in other areas examined far outweigh differences. It is clear, however, that larger school staffs demand a greater amount of time of the principal for, say, evaluation, simply by sheer force of numbers. While school size was not a direct consideration in the examination of the principal's task here, future studies which use school size as an independent variable should increase further our understanding of the principalship.

The similarities of the principal's task, regardless of school level or location, as well as similarities in other personal, educational, experiential and professional dimensions, provides support for the view that the

study of the principalship qua principalship may be a better approach than the fragmented efforts of the past which focused on elementary, intermediate or senior high schools.

Many college and university pre-service programs for principals do not employ this fragmented approach. Generally, these programs tend to assume that the role of the principal is essentially the same irrespective of the school grade level, the general school social and psychological environment, or the school's geographical location. What is questionable is the content of the courses they provide.

Pre-service preparation programs come under criticism from principals for their lack of field orientation. Various comments by principals also indicate that they believe university staff to be too far removed from the realities of the job of the principal to be truly effective. However, principals do believe that several of the courses they were exposed to (e.g., the internship, general school administration, school financing) are useful. It is the task of those who teach these and other courses required as pre-service preparation to infuse practical contemporary school problems and practices into theoretical and conceptual frameworks. In addition, pre-service courses should emphasize interpersonal skills, communication skills, time management, staff development, and evaluation. In-service programs must also reflect contemporary school problems and issues, and emphasize many of the same skill areas.

The need for continuing examination is always apparent in any study. It is evident that the foregoing comments point to that need explicitly. For example, principals indicate that they have considerable influence in

decisions which affect several important aspects of schools. What is not clear is how that influence is used, and the relationship between influence exhibited by the principal and the effectiveness of the school in terms of, say, student academic achievement, staff morale and satisfaction, and principal satisfaction. On another level, a question may be raised regarding the performance of educational leadership tasks and school effectiveness as manifested by student academic achievement and staff growth. These areas are clearly the basis for important future research.

The effectiveness of schools depends upon the skills and abilities of their principals. We must increase our knowledge of what skills and abilities are necessary, how they are best delivered, and how they are best used in the school setting. This exploratory study provides some tentative answers, but clearly points to the necessity for continuing study.

FOOTNOTES

1. Paul R. Pierce, The Origin and Development of the Public School Principalship. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935, p. 12.

2. Ibid.

3. Henri Fayol, Administration Industrielle et Générale. Translated by Constance Storrs, General and Industrial Management. London: Pitman, 1949

4. Luther Gulick, "Notes on the Theory of Organization," in Luther Gulick and L. Urwick, Papers on the Science of Administration. New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1937, p. 13.

5. Jesse B. Sears, The Nature of the Administrative Process. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1950.

6. Ordway Tead, Art of Administration. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951, p. 105.

7. Edward H. Litchfield, "Notes on a General Theory of Administration," Administrative Science Quarterly, June 1956, pp. 3-29.

8. Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision Making Processes in Administrative Organization. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1961.

9. Daniel E. Griffiths, Administrative Theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1959.

10. John A. Ramseyer, et al., Factors Affecting Educational Administration. Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, Ohio State University, 1955, p. 20.

11. Russell T. Gregg, "The Administrative Process," in Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg (eds.), Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1957, p. 274.

12. Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, Better Teaching in School Administration. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1955.

13. John K. Hemphill, Daniel E. Griffiths and Norman Frederiksen, Administrative Performance and Personality: A Study of the Principal in a Simulated Elementary School. New York: Teachers College. Columbia University, 1962, pp. 7-8.

14. Ibid., pp. 328-329.

15. Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriott, Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

16. Hemphill, Griffiths and Frederiksen, op. cit.

17. Edgar L. Morphet and William C. Schutz, Procedures for Identifying Persons with Potential for Public School Administrative Positions. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 1076. Berkeley: University of California, 1966.

18. Elizabeth Martin Atley, "Creativity in Educational Administration," Journal of Experimental Education, Summer 1966, pp. 21-27.

19. John K. Hemphill, James M. Richards, and Richard E. Peterson, Report of the Senior High School Principalship. Washington, D. C.: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1965.

20. Ibid.

21. R. Bruce McPherson, Columbus Salley and Melany E. Baehr, "What Principals Do: Preliminary Implications of a National Occupational Analysis of the School Principalship," Consortium Currents, Leadership and Change in Educational Administration, Vol. 2, No. 1, Fall 1975, pp. 1-10.

22. Edwin F. Sause, "Demonstrating Competency as a Principal," NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 58, No. 383, September 1974, pp. 19-26.

23. Ibid., p. 25.

24. See for example, Mario Fantini, Marilyn Gittell and Richard Magat. Community Control and the Urban School. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970; Henry Levin, Community Control of Schools. Washington, D. C.: Brookings Institution, 1970.

25. Lawrence Downey, The Task of Public Education. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1960.

26. James M. Lipham and James A. Hoeh, Jr., The Principalship: Foundations and Functions. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1974.

27. Gregg, op. cit.

28. Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, op. cit.

29. Robert S. Fisk, "The Task of Educational Administration," in Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg (eds.), Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1957, p. 211.

30. Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederiksen, op. cit.

31. Downey, op. cit.

32. McPherson, Salley, and Baehr, op. cit.

33. Luren L. Cunningham, "Collective Negotiations and the Principalship," in Patrick W. Carlton and Harold I. Goodwin (eds.), The Collective Dilemma Negotiations in Education. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1969, pp. 255-272.

34. Ronald G. Corwin, "The Anatomy of Militant Professionalization," in Patrick W. Carlton and Harold I. Goodwin (eds.), op. cit., pp. 237-248.

35. For a discussion and summary of several prevailing views on the role of the principal as instructional leader, as innovator, and as coordinator, viewed as a new role, see Jo Ann Mazzarella,"The Principal's Role in Instructional Planning." School Leadership Digest, Second Series, No. 8, Arlington, Va.: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1976.

36. Lipham and Hoeh, Jr., op. cit.

37. Hemphill, Richards and Peterson, op. cit., pp. 9-10.

38. Mazzarella, op. cit., pp. 5-7.

39. William D. Hedges, "The Principal, the Computer and Emerging Applications to Instruction," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 55, No. 3, November 1973, pp. 174-177.

40. Report of the California Commission for Reform of Intermediate and Secondary Education. The RISE Report. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1975.

41. Hemphill, Richards, and Peterson, op. cit., p. 17.

42. "The Elementary School Principalship in 1968," Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, p. 11.

43. Becker, et al., Elementary School Principals and Their Schools: Beacons of Brilliance and Potholes of Pestilence. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1971.

44. Hemphill, Richards, and Peterson, op. cit., p. 19.

45. Ibid., p. 27.

46. Ibid., p. 26.

47. Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederiksen, op. cit., p. 67.

48. Hemphill, Richards, and Peterson, op. cit., p. 27.

49. Becker, et al., op. cit., p. 137.

50. Hemphill, Richards, and Peterson, op. cit., p. 31.

51. California State Assembly Bill 122 (Ryan Act), Sec. 13141, 1970. Amended by SB740, January 1976.

52. Gross and Herriott, op. cit., p. 88.

53. Hemphill, Griffiths,and Frederiksen, op. cit., p. 67

54. Hemphill, Richards, and Peterson, op. cit., p. 36.

55. Becker, et al., p. 135.

56. Joseph Melton, "Role Perceptions of the Elementary School Principal," The National Elementary Principal, Vol. L, No. 4, February 1971, p. 43.

57. Hemphill, Richards, and Peterson, op. cit., p. 41.

58. Becker, et al., op. cit., p. 176.

59. Gross and Herriott, op. cit., p. 88

60. Hemphill, Richards, and Peterson, op. cit., p. 79.

61. Ibid., p. 42.

62. Becker, et al., op. cit., p. 177.

63. Statistical significance is determined through the use of Zubin's monograph for testing statistical significance of differences between percentages. See Joseph Zubin, "Monographs for the Testing of Statistical Significance of Differences Between Percentages," Journal of the American Statistical Association, Vol. 34, pp. 539-544, 1939. The original monograph was recalculated and adapted for inclusion in A. N. Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966, pp. 287-292.

64. California Senate Bill 90 is generally regarded as a school finance reform measure and is now incorporated in several sections of the California State Education Code. We assume that the response of principals refers to the allowable growth rate of wealthy districts which places a limitation on revenue raised through taxation and makes it a function of student enrollment. See California State Education Code, sections 17301, 17601, 17608, 17901, 17970, 18102.

65. National Education Association, 24th Biennial Survey of Public School Personnel, 1968-69: Data for Systems with Enrollments of 12,000 or More. Research Report 1969--R7. Washington, D. C.: The Association, 1969.

66. "The Elementary School Principalship in 1968," op. cit., p. 11.

67. Hemphill, Richards, and Peterson, op. cit., p. 17.

68. Becker, et al., op. cit., p. 175.

69. Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederiksen, op cit., pp. 332-333.

70. Gross and Herriott, op. cit., pp. 155-157.

71. Leonard Williams, "Principal-Staff Relations: Situational Mediator of Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. 9, No. 1, May 1971, pp. 66-73.

72. Donald P. Mitchell and Anne Hawley, Leadership in Public Education Study: A Look at the Overlook. New York: Academy for Educational Development, Inc., 1972, pp. 40-42.

73. California State Assembly Bill 122, op. cit.

74. Mitchell and Hawley, op. cit., p. 33.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: John Wiley, 1964.

Bales, R. F., "In Conference," Harvard Business Review, Vol. 32, No. 2, 1954, pp. 44-50.

Becker, Gerald, et al., Elementary School Principals and Their Schools: Beacons of Brilliance and Potholes of Pestilence. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1971. ERIC Ed. 056-380.

Campbell, Roald F. and Russell T. Gregg, Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

Charters, W. W., Jr. et al., Perspectives on Educational Administration and the Behavioral Sciences. Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965.

Corwin, Ronald G., "The Anatomy of Militant Professionalization," in Carlton, Patrick W. and Harold I. Goodwin (eds.), The Collective Dilemma: Negotiations in Education. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1969, pp. 237-248.

Cunningham, Luren L., "Collective Negotiations and the Principalship," in Carlton, Patrick W. and Harold I. Goodwin (eds.), The Collective Dilemma: Negotiations in Education. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1969, pp. 225-272.

Erickson, Donald A. "The School Administrator," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 37, No. 4, October 1967, pp. 417-432.

Faber, Charles F. and Gilbert F. Shearon, Elementary School Administration: Theory and Practice. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1970.

Fantini, Mario, Marilyn Gittell, Richard Magat, Community Control and the Urban School. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Farquhar, Robin H. and Philip R. Piele, Preparing Educational Leaders: A Review of Recent Literature. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.

Fayol, Henri, Administration Industrielle et Générale. Translated by Constance Storrs, General and Industrial Management. London: Pitman, 1949.

Getzels, Jacob W., James M. Lipham and Roald F. Campbell, Educational Administration as a Social Process Theory, Research, Practice. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Gouldner, Alvin W., "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles," I. Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 2, 1957, pp. 281-306.

_____, "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles," II. Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 3, 1958, pp. 444-480.

Griffiths, Daniel E., Administrative Theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1959.

Gross, Neal and Robert E. Herriott, Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.

Gulick, Luther H. and Lyndall F. Urwick (eds.), Papers on the Science of Administration. New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937.

Halpin, Andrew W., Theory and Research in Administration. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966.

Hedges, William D., "The Principal, The Computer and Emerging Applications to Instruction," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 55, No. 3, November 1973, pp. 174-177.

Hemphill, John K., Daniel E. Griffiths, and Norman Frederiksen, Administrative Performance and Personality: A Study of the Principal in a Simulated Elementary School. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.

Hemphill, John K., James M. Richards, and Richard E. Peterson, Report of the Senior High School Principalship. Washington, D. C.: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1965.

Herriott, Robert E. and Nancy Holt St. John, Social Class and the Urban School. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.

Kahn, Robert L, et al., Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.

Levin, Henry, Community Control of Schools. Washington, D. C.: Brookings Institution, 1970.

Lipham, James M. and James A. Hoeh, Jr., The Principalship: Foundations and Functions. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Mazzarella, Jo Ann,"The Principal's Role in Instructional Planning." School Leadership Digest, Second Series, No. 8 Arlington, Va.: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1976.

McCleary, Lloyd E. and Stephen Hencley, Secondary School Administration: Theoretical Bases of Professional Practice. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1965.

McPherson, R. Bruce, Columbus Salley, and Melany E. Baehr, "What Principals Do: Preliminary Implications of 'A National Occupational Analysis of the School Principalship.'" Consortium Currents, Leadership and Change in Educational Administration, Vol. 2, No. 1, Fall 1975, pp. 1-10.

Melton, Joseph, "Role Perceptions of Elementary School Principals." The National Elementary Principal, Vol. L, No. 4, February 1971, pp. 40-43.

Mitchell, Donald P. and Anne Hawley, Leadership in Public Education: A Look at the Overlooked. New York: Academy for Educational Development, Inc., 1972.

Moore, Hollis A. Jr., Studies in School Administration: A Report on the CPEA. Washington, D. C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1957.

Morphet, Edgar L., et al., Educational Organization and Administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

Morphet, Edgar L. and William C. Schutz, Procedures for Identifying Persons with Potential for Public School Administrative Positions. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Cooperative Research Project No. 1076. Berkeley: University of California, 1966.

Ready, R. K., The Administrator's Job: Issues and Dilemmas. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Report of the California Commission for Reform of Intermediate and Secondary Education, The RISE Report. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1975.

Robbins, Stephen P., The Administrative Process: Integrating Theory and Practice. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.

Roe, William H. and Thelbert L. Drake, The Principalship. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1974.

Sause, Edwin F., "Demonstrating Competency as a Principal," NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 58, No. 383, September 1974, pp. 19-26.

Saxe, Richard W., Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1968.

Simon, Herbert A. Administrative Behavior. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1961.

Walker, W. G., The Principal at Work: Case Studies in School Administration. Sydney, Australia: Halstead Press, 1965 (University of Queensland Press, 1965).

Williams, Leonard, "Principal-Staff Relations: Situational Mediator of Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Administration, Vol. 9, No. 1, May 1971, pp. 66-73.

Appendix A

Covering Letter

Questionnaire

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94720

Dear Principal:

The problems and responsibilities principals of today's schools are faced with are unprecedented in school administration. Called upon to manage the school, supervise and evaluate school personnel, provide instructional leadership, build school-community relationships, mediate student, teacher or parental conflicts, participate in teacher bargaining, and, of course, to arrange and participate in numerous school district or community related meetings, principals have assumed a task of herculean proportions. Yet, despite the shift in the role of the modern principal, many certification or training programs have not kept pace with current role expectations.

Whether traditional or "innovative," training programs for principals tend to assume that the role of the principal is essentially the same regardless of the school level, the general school social and psychological environment, or the school's geographical location. Training programs are seldom designed to address the differentiated needs

of the schools and communities in which future principals desire to serve. Thus, an analysis of variations that are thought to exist in principal role behavior by school grade level and by school geographical location, will enable pre- and in-service training programs to be developed which will address current needs more appropriately.

The following questionnaire has been designed to explore differences in role behavior and other selected characteristics of elementary, intermediate and senior high school principals in urban, suburban and rural school districts. By analyzing data in these areas we hope to specify more precisely necessary or desirable variations in principal pre- and in-service training programs and to develop a principal descriptive index based on selected differences or similarities between principals in urban, suburban and rural elementary, intermediate and senior high schools that will be useful in examining principal role behavior.

Your experience and views are invaluable inputs into the conceptualization and design of pre- and in-service principal training programs. We hope, therefore, that you will take the time to complete this questionnaire. The questionnaire need not be signed and the information requested will be reported only in aggregate form, thus ensuring

confidentiality. Participation in this study is voluntary.

The results of the study will be mailed to you, if you wish, upon its completion. To receive a copy of the results please call Ms. Viviane Dutoit, secretary, Division of Policy Planning and Administration, Department of Education, University of California, Berkeley, (415) 642-4204 and have your name placed on the mailing list.

Thank you for your cooperation and for your response by April 14, 1975. Stamped, self-addressed envelopes are provided for you to return the completed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Rodney J. Reed
Assistant Professor

RJR:mv

PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS.
PLEASE CHECK THE CORRECT RESPONSE OR WRITE IN YOUR ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION. IF MORE SPACE IS NEEDED, USE THE REVERSE SIDE OF THE PAGE. THANK YOU.

PART I: School Characteristics

1. What is the name of the city in which your school is located? (Please write in.)

_____
(Name of City)

2. Is the city in which your school is located essentially--
(Please check correck response.)

Urban _____
Suburban _____
Rural (farming) _____
Rural (non-farming) _____

3. Please check the economic level that best reflects the family income of the majority of students who attend your school.

(Family income above $20,000)_____ (Family income $8,000-$13,999)_____

(Family income $14,000-$19,000)_____ (Family income $4,000-$7,999)_____

(Family income below $4,000)_____

4. What grades, e.g., 7-9; K-3; etc., are taught in the school in which you serve as principal?

_____
(Grades Taught)

5. For each position listed, please indicate the number of staff members who are currently employed in your school. (If your school does not have staff for the positions listed please write in "0".)

Positions	No. of Persons Employed		Not Applicable
	Part-time	Fulltime	
Regular faculty			
Vice principals			
Deans			
Counselors			
Specialists in Reading, Math, etc.			
Librarians			
Nurse			
School Psychologist			
EMR Teacher/Specialist			
EH Teacher/Specialist			
Classified: a) Clerical			
b) Instructional aides			
c) Community aides			
d) Custodians			
e) Cafeteria staff			
Other: (please write in.)			

6. Please indicate the approximate number of students currently enrolled in your school by ethnic group. (Please write in.)

Ethnic Group	Approx. No. Presently Enrolled	Approx.% of Total Student Population
Asian		
Black		
Chicano		
Native-American		
White		
Others (please list)		
Total Current Enrollment		100%

7. Does your school have any of the following organizational arrangements? (Please check correct response.)

Arrangement	Yes	No	Plans to Implement
Open classrooms			
Structured traditional classrooms			
Flexible scheduling			
Differentiated staffing			
Team Teaching			
Individualized Instruction (e.g. programmed instruction, contract systems, individual learning)			
PTA or Parent Club			
Community or Parent Advisory Board			
Multi-age pupil groupings			
Non-graded classrooms			
In-class paraprofessional program			
Ethnic Studies program			
Gifted student program			
EMR Program			
EH Program			
School within a school program			

PART II: Principal Characteristics

8. How long have you been principal of this school? (Please write in.)

_____
(Number of years including 1974-75 school year.)

9. What is your sex? (Please check correct response.)

Female	_____
Male	_____

10. What is your age? (Please check correct age range.)

Age Range	
20 - 29	
30 - 39	
40 - 49	
50 - 59	
60 and above	

11. In what type of community(ies) did you mainly live in as a youth? (Please check correct response.)

Urban	_____
Rural	_____
Suburban	_____
Urban and rural	_____
Urban and suburban	_____

12. Please check the type of school in which you completed the majority of your elementary, intermediate, and senior high school education.

School Type	Elementary	Intermediate	Senior High
Public			
Religious (e.g., Catholic, Lutheran, etc.)			
Private, non-Religious			

13. Please list all academic degrees earned beyond high school, where earned, major and minor fields of study and year degree was received.

Degree(s) Earned	College/ University	Major Field of Study	Important Minor Field(s) of Study	Year Degree Received

14. Please list all California credentials you currently hold, college or University where requirements were met, and year received.

Type Credential	College/University	Year Received

15. What is your present annual regular salary as principal? (Please check correct response.)

Salary Range	
$11,999 and less	_____
$12,000-$16,999	_____
$17,000-$21,999	_____
$22,000-$26,999	_____
$27,000 and above	_____

16. How many working days are used to determine your annual regular salary? (Please write in.)

_____
(Number of Days)

17. Please list all school related professional work experiences you have had since graduating from college. Please indicate the general economic status (poor, lower middle class, upper middle class, wealthy) of the school in which you worked.

Position	No. of Years in Position	Dates of Employment	Location (City & State)	Grade Level of School	Economic Status of School: Poor, Lower Middle Class, Upper Middle Class, Wealthy

18. Please list all non-school related professional work experiences you have had since graduating from college.

Position	No. of Years in Position	Dates of Employment	Name of Organization	Location (City & State)

PART III: Role Activity Perceptions

19. The list below contains several activites you may engage in as a principal. Please check the approximate amount of time you actually spend performing each activity and the amount of time you would like to spend performing each activity during an average work week. (Please read the complete list of activities before answering.

Activity	Estimated Time Actually Spent per week (hours)					Estimated Time Desired To Spend per week(hours)				
	Not Applicable	None	Less Than 2 hrs.	2-5 hrs.	More Than 5 hrs.	Not Applicable	None	Less Than 2 hrs.	2-5 hrs.	More Than 5 hrs.
Meeting with Teachers Individually and in Groups										
Teaching or covering classes for teachers										
Meeting with students individually and in groups										
Handling student discipline										
Caring for health needs of students										
Meeting with individual parents										
Meeting with parent groups (PTA, Parent Clubs, etc.)										
Meeting with school community groups										

Activity (Continued)	Estimated Time Actually Spent per week (hours)					Estimated Time Desired to Spend per week (hours)				
	Not Applicable	None	Less Than 2 hrs.	2-5 hrs.	More Than 5 hrs.	Not Applicable	None	Less Than 2 hrs.	2-5 hrs.	More Than 5 hrs.
Participating in school-community activities										
Working with school-community groups										
Managing the school office										
Supervising and evaluating school staff										
Mediating staff personnel problems or concerns										
Preparing required school reports										
Preparing school class schedule										
Supervising school cafeteria										
Supervising bus loading										
Supervising school yard										
Coordinating work with school secretary										
Developing and establishing school public relations										
Evaluating school programs										

Activity (Continued)	Estimated Time Actually Spent per week (hours)					Estimated Time Desired to Spend per week (hours)				
	Not Applicable	None	Less Than 2 hrs.	2-5 hrs.	More Than 5 hrs.	Not Applicable	None	Less Than 2 hrs.	2-5 hrs.	More Than 5 hrs.
Planning and preparing school budget										
Preparing proposals for funding										
Developing or revising school policies/procedures										
Developing new educational programs and projects										
Planning and conducting staff in-service programs										
Conducting faculty meetings										
Monitoring special state or federal programs										
Evaluating special state or federal programs										
Training staff for special state or federal programs										
Managing budget for special state or federal programs										
Becoming familiar with guidelines for special state or federal programs										
Ensuring community involvement										

20. How much influence do you have concerning the following activities? (Please circle the appropriate number for each activity.)

Activity	Very Much							None
Selecting school staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Determining school budget	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Allocating school resources	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Determining school programs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Determining school policies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

PART IV: Professionalism

21. In terms of your career aspirations, please indicate your interest in the items listed below. (Check correct response.)

Aspirations	Very Much Interested	Have Seriously Thought About It	Undecided	Not Interested	Not Applicable
Remain principal of this school for at least the next five years					
Become principal of a more prestigious: Elementary School / Intermediate School / Senior High School within the next five years					
Earn a Ph.D or Ed.D degree					
Earn another administrative credential					
Become a district/ central office administrator					
Become a School Superintendent					
Become a college/ University Administrator					
Become a college/ University Professor					
Become a fulltime member of a private educational consulting firm					

Aspirations	Very Much Interested	Have Seriously Thought About It	Undecided	Not Interested	Not Applicable
Assume an administrative or consultant position with a state education agency					
Assume an administrative or consultant position with a Federal Education Agency					
Assume an administrative position with a professional school administrator organization					
Enter into the political arena as a fulltime educational lobbyist					
Pursue a career outside of education					
Other (Please write in.)					

22. In relation to the school in which you are principal, please indicate your present level of satisfaction with each of the following activities. (Please check correct response.)

Activity	Satisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied
Parent Involvement			
Community Relations			
Teacher Cooperation			
Student Academic Performance			
Willingness of Staff to attempt innovative programs			
District Office Support			
Quality of Teaching Staff			
Quality of Non-teaching Staff			
Adequacy of school budget			
Staff Morale			
School Human Relations Program			

23. If dissatisfied was checked for any of the activities in question number 22, please write in as concisely as possible why.

PART V: Training

24. Please rate how useful each of the following general college/university school principal pre-service courses has been in your present position as principal. (Check correct response.)

Course	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not at all Useful	Was Not Offered	Did Not Take
General School Administration					
Curriculum Development					
School Finance/Economics					
School Personnel Management					
School Organization					
Education and the Law					
Internship/Field Experience					
Teacher Negotiations					
Supervision/Evaluation					
Others: (please list)					

PART V: Training

24. Please rate how useful each of the following general college/university school principal pre-service courses has been in your present position as principal. (Check correct response.)

Course	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not at all Useful	Was Not Offered	Did Not Take
General School Administration					
Curriculum Development					
School Finance/Economics					
School Personnel Management					
School Organization					
Education and the Law					
Internship/Field Experience					
Teacher Negotiations					
Supervision/Evaluation					
Others: (please list)					

25. Would you please provide the information requested below for administrator in-service programs you may have participated in during the past three years. If you have not participated in such programs please write in none and go to the following question.

In-service Program	Sponsoring Organization	Focus of Program	Length of Program (days)	City, State Where Held	When (year)	Rating of Program for Present Position		
						Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful
A								
B								
C								
D								
E								
F								

146

26. What kinds of pre-service courses or experiences would have been most helpful to you in your present position? (Please write in. If more space is needed, please continue on reverse side of page.)

27. What kinds of in-service experiences would have been most helpful to you in your present position? (Please write in. If more space is needed, please continue on reverse side of page.)

28. Which of your previous work experiences in or out of education have been most helpful to you in your present position as principal? Why? (Please write in. If more space is needed, please continue on reverse side of page.)

29. Please describe briefly one or two of the most significant changes you implemented in your present school during the last three years.

30. How did your pre-service or in-service training help you implement these changes?

31. Considering your experiences as a principal, what suggestions can you make concerning pre-service and in-service training programs for principals? How might these programs be made more effective?

32. What would help you to be a more effective principal? Please consider the question in terms of your own professional development, your current job description and responsibilities, and also in terms of the context and conditions of your work situation. (If more space is needed, please continue on the reverse side of the page.)

Appendix B

Table B-1

Actual and Desired Time Principals Devote to Duties and Responsibilities per Week

Duties/Responsibilities	Time Categories (hours)*	School Level and Location: Senior High — Urban (N = 3) Act.	Urban (N = 3) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Intermediate — Urban (N = 6) Act.	Urban (N = 6) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Elementary — Urban (N = 10) Act.	Urban (N = 10) Des.	Suburban (N = 9) Act.	Suburban (N = 9) Des.	Rural (N = 1) Act.	Rural (N = 1) Des.	Totals (N = 41) Act.	Totals (N = 41) Des.
Meeting with teachers individually and in groups	N. A.																				
	None																				
	< 2			1 (25%)							1 (25%)			2 (20%)						3 (7%)	1 (2%)
	2 - 5	1 (33%)			1 (25%)			3 (50%)	2 (33%)	4 (100%)		1 (50%)		5 (50%)	5 (50%)	5 (56%)	2 (22%)			19 (46%)	10 (24%)
	> 5	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	3 (50%)	4 (67%)		3 (75%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	4 (44%)	7 (78%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	19 (46%)	30 (73%)
Teaching or covering classes for teachers	N. A.			1 (25%)	1 (25%)									1 (10%)	1 (10%)					2 (5%)	2 (5%)
	None			(25%)	(25%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	4 (67%)	3 (50%)	1 (25%)			1 (50%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)		1 (11%)			11 (27%)	11 (27%)
	< 2	2 (67%)		2 (50%)	2 (50%)			2 (33%)	3 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)		5 (50%)	4 (40%)	9 (100%)	4 (44%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	24 (59%)	15 (37%)
	2 - 5		2 (67%)								2 (50%)	1 (50%)		1 (10%)	2 (20%)		4 (44%)			2 (5%)	10 (24%)
	> 5	1 (33%)	1 (33%)							1 (25%)	1 (25%)		1 (50%)							2 (5%)	3 (7%)
Meeting with students individually and in groups	N. A.																				
	None													1 (10%)	1 (10%)					1 (2%)	1 (2%)
	< 2	1 (33%)		2 (50%)				2 (33%)	1 (17%)	2 (50%				4 (40%)	2 (20%)	4 (44%)				15 (37%)	3 (7%)
	2 - 5	2 (67%)	2 (67%)		1 (25%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (33%)	2 (33%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)			2 (20%)	3 (30%	1 (11%)	6 (67%)	1 (100%)		10 (24%)	17 (41%)
	> 5		1 (33%)	2 (50%)	3 (75%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (33%)	3 (50%)	1 (25%	2 (50%)	2 (100%	2 (100%)	3 (30%)	4 (40%	4 (44%)	3 (33%)		1 (100%)	15 (37%)	20 (49%)
Handling student discipline	N. A.																				
	None	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)		1 (50%)	1 (17%)	4 (67%)		1 (25%)		1 (50%)		3 (30%)		2 (22%)			3 (7%)	15 (37%)
	< 2	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)		1 (50%)	2 (33%)	2 (33%	3 (75%	2 (50%)			4 (40%)	3 (30%)	2 (22%	6 (67%)		1 (100%)	15 (37%)	19 (46%)
	2 - 5	1 (33%)				2 (100%)		1 (17%		1 (25%	1 (25%)	2 (100%		4 (40%)	3 (30%)	4 (44%		1 (100%)		16 (39%)	4 (10%)
	> 5							2 (33%)					1 (50%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)	3 (33%)	1 (11%)			7 (17%)	3 (7%)

*N.A. = not applicable; < 2 = less than 2; > 5 = more than five. †Act.= Actual time; Des. = Desired time.

Table B-1 (Cont'd)

Actual and Desired Time Principals Devote to Duties and Responsibilities per Week

Duties/Responsibilities	Time Categories (hours)*	School Level and Location: Senior High — Urban (N = 3) Act.	Urban (N = 3) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Intermediate — Urban (N = 6) Act.	Urban (N = 6) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Elementary — Urban (N = 10) Act.	Urban (N = 10) Des.	Suburban (N = 9) Act.	Suburban (N = 9) Des.	Rural (N = 1) Act.	Rural (N = 1) Des.	Totals (N = 41) Act.	Totals (N = 41) Des.
Caring for health needs of students	N. A.	1 (33%)	1 (33%)											1 (10%)						2 (5%)	1 (2%)
	None		1 (33%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	5 (83%)	5 (83%)		1 (25%)		1 (50%)	2 (20%)	6 (60%)	1 (11%)	4 (44%)			11 (27%)	20 (49%)
	< 2	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	7 (70%)	4 (40%)	8 (89%)	4 (44%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	27 (66%)	19 (46%)
	2 - 5									1 (25%)							1 (11%)			1 (2%)	1 (2%)
	> 5																				
Meeting with individual parents	N. A.																				
	None																				
	< 2	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)			3 (50%)	3 (50%)			1 (50%)		5 (50%)	5 (50%)	5 (56%)	3 (33%)			16 (39%)	14 (34%)
	2 - 5	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)		1 (50%)	5 (50%)	4 (40%)	3 (33%)	5 (56%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	21 (51%)	21 (51%)
	> 5					1 (50%)	1 (50%)			1 (25%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)		1 (10%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)			4 (10%)	6 (15%)
Meeting with parent groups (PTA, parent clubs, etc.)	N. A.																				
	None																				
	< 2	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	4 (67%)	4 (67%)		1 (25%)	2 (100%)		4 (40%)	6 (60%)	6 (67%)	5 (56%)			19 (46%)	21 (51%)
	2 - 5	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (33%)	2 (33%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)		1 (50%)	4 (40%)	3 (30%)	3 (33%)	4 (44%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	19 (46%)	17 (41%)
	> 5									1 (25%)	1 (25%)		1 (50%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)					3 (7%)	3 (7%)
Meeting with school community groups	N. A.													1 (10%)	1 (10%)		1 (11%)			1 (2%)	2 (5%)
	None			1 (25%)				1 (17%)	2 (33%)							2 (22%)	7 (78%)			4 (10%)	9 (30%)
	< 2	1 (33%)	2 (67%)		1 (25%)	2 (100%)		4 (67%)	3 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	2 (100%)		4 (40%)	5 (50%)	7 (78%)	1 (11%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	23 (56%)	14 (34%)
	2 - 5	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)			1 (17%)	1 (17%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)		1 (50%)	5 (50%)	4 (40%)					13 (32%)	12 (29%)
	> 5						2 (100%)				1 (25%)		1 (50%)								4 (10%)

* N.A. = not applicable; < 2 = less than 2; > 5 = more than five. † Act. = Actual time; Des. = Desired time.

Table B-1 (Cont'd)

Actual and Desired Time Principals Devote to Duties and Responsibilities per Week

Duties/Responsibilities	Time Categories (hours)*	School Level and Location: Senior High — Urban (N = 3) Act.	Urban (N = 3) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Intermediate — Urban (N = 6) Act.	Urban (N = 6) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Elementary — Urban (N = 10) Act.	Urban (N = 10) Des.	Suburban (N = 9) Act.	Suburban (N = 9) Des.	Rural (N = 1) Act.	Rural (N = 1) Des.	Totals (N = 41) Act.	Totals (N = 41) Des.
Participating in school-community groups	N. A.																				
	None																	1 (100%)		1 (2%)	
	< 2	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)		1 (17%)	2 (33%)	1 (25%)		1 (50%)	1 (50%)	7 (70%)	5 (50%)	7 (78%)	6 (67%)		1 (100%)	21 (51%)	18 (44%)
	2 - 5	1 (33%)	1 (33%)				2 (100%)	5 (83%)	4 (67%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)			13 (32%)	16 (39%)
	> 5	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)				1 (25%)	3 (75%)					1 (11%)	1 (11%)			6 (15%)	7 (17%)
Working with school-community groups	N. A.											1 (50%)	1 (50%)							1 (2%)	1 (2%)
	None			1 (25%)				1 (17%)	1 (17%)						1 (10%)					2 (5%)	2 (5%)
	< 2	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	1 (50%)		1 (17%)	2 (33%)	2 (50%)		1 (50%)	1 (50%)	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	7 (78%)	5 (56%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	21 (51%)	19 (46%)
	2 - 5					1 (50%)	2 (100%)	4 (67%)	3 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)			4 (40%)	4 (40%)	2 (22%)	4 (44%)			13 (32%)	14 (34%)
	> 5	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)						3 (75%)			1 (10%)						4 (10%)	5 (12%)
Developing and establishing school public relations	N. A.													1 (10%)	1 (10%)					1 (2%)	1 (2%)
	None	1 (33%)				1 (50%)							1 (50%)							2 (5%)	1 (2%)
	< 2	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)			4 (67%)	2 (33%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)			3 (30%)	1 (10%)	4 (44%)	4 (44%)			17 (41%)	12 (29%)
	2 - 5		1 (33%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (17%)	3 (50%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)		4 (40%)	5 (56%)	5 (56%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	12 (29%)	20 (49%)
	> 5			1 (25%)	1 (25%)		1 (50%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)			1 (50%)		6 (60%)	4 (40%)					9 (22%)	7 (17%)
Ensuring community involvement	N. A.							1 (17%)	1 (17%)							1 (11%)	2 (22%)			2 (5%)	3 (7%)
	None			2 (50%)	2 (50%)			1 (17%)	1 (17%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)		1 (50%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)			8 (20%)	8 (20%)
	< 2	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)		3 (50%)	2 (33%)	2 (50%)		1 (50%)		5 (50%)	4 (40%)	5 (56%)	4 (44%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	21 (51%)	13 (32%)
	2 - 5	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)		2 (50%)	1 (50%)		4 (40%)	3 (30%)					9 (22%)	11 (27%)
	> 5						1 (50%)						1 (50%)		2 (20%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)			1 (2%)	6 (15%)

* N.A. = not applicable; < 2 = less than 2; > 5 = more than five. †Act. = Actual time; Des. = Desired time.

Table B-1 (Cont'd)

Actual and Desired Time Principals Devote to Duties and Responsibilities per Week

Duties/Responsibilities	Time Categories (hours)*	School Level and Location: Senior High Urban (N = 3) Act.	Urban (N = 3) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Intermediate Urban (N = 6) Act.	Urban (N = 6) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Elementary Urban (N = 10) Act.	Urban (N = 10) Des.	Suburban (N = 9) Act.	Suburban (N = 9) Des.	Rural (N = 1) Act.	Rural (N = 1) Des.	Totals (N = 41) Act.	Totals (N = 41) Des.
Supervising and evaluating school staff	N. A.																				
	None														1 (10%)						1 (2%)
	< 2					1 (50%)		1 (17%)		1 (25%)		1 (50%)		2 20%	1 (10%)	2 (22%)	4 (44%)	1 100%		9 (22%)	5 (12%)
	2 - 5	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)			3 (50%)	1 (17%)	1 (25%)	3 (75%)	1 (50%		6 (60%	3 (30%)	4 (44%)	2 (22%)			20 (49%)	13 (32%)
	> 5	1 (33%	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%	2 (33%)	5 (83%	2 (50%)	1 (25%)		2 100%	2 20%	5 (50%	3 (33%)	3 (33%)		1 (100%	12 (29%)	22 (54%)
Mediating staff personnel problems or concerns	N. A.																				
	None		1 (33%)				1 (50%)		1 (17%				2 (100%		1 (100%						6 (15%)
	< 2	1 (33%)		3 (100%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	4 (67%)	3 (50%	3 (75%)	2 (50%)	2 100%		6 (60%	5 (50%	9 100%	9 100%	1 100%	1 100%	30 (73%)	23 (56%)
	2 - 5		1 (33%)	1 100%	2 (50%	1 (50%)		1 (17%)	1 (17%		1 (25%)			3 (30%	4 (40%					6 (15%)	9 (22%)
	> 5	2 (67%)	1 (33%)					1 (17%)	1 (17%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)			1 (10%						1 (2%)	3 (7%)
Planning and conducting staff in-service programs	N. A.																				
	None							1 (17%)		1 (25%)								1 100%	1 100%	3 (7%)	1 (2%)
	< 2	3 (100%		3 (100%)	2 (50%)	2 (100%	1 (50%)	3 (50%)	2 (33%	2 (50%)				6 (60%)	5 (50%	8 (89%)	3 (33%)			27 (66%)	13 (32%)
	2 - 5		2 (67%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%		1 (50%)	2 (33%)	4 (67%)	1 25%	3 (75%)	2 100%	1 (50%)	4 40%	4 (40%)	1 (11%)	5 (56%)			11 (27%)	22 (54%)
	> 5		1 (33%)								1 (25%)		1 (50%)		1 (10%)		1 (11%)				5 12%
Conducting faculty meetings	N. A.																				
	None									1 (25%)										1 (2%)	
	< 2	3 100%	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	3 (100%	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	4 (67%)	5 (83%	3 (75%)	4 100%	2 100%	2 100%	5 50%	7 (70%	9 100%	8 89%)	1 100%	1 (100%)	31 (76%)	34 (83%)
	2 - 5			1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%	1 (50%)	2 (33%)	1 (17%					5 (50%	3 (30%		1 (11%)			9 (22%)	7 (17%)
	> 5																				

* N.A. = not applicable; < 2 = less than 2; > 5 = more than five. † Act. = Actual time; Des. = Desired time.

Table B-1 (Cont'd)

Actual and Desired Time Principals Devote to Duties and Responsibilities per Week

Duties/Responsibilities	Time Categories (hours)*	School Level and Location: Senior High — Urban (N = 3) Act.	Urban (N = 3) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Intermediate — Urban (N = 6) Act.	Urban (N = 6) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Elementary — Urban (N = 10) Act.	Urban (N = 10) Des.	Suburban (N = 9) Act.	Suburban (N = 9) Des.	Rural (N = 1) Act.	Rural (N = 1) Des.	Totals (N = 41) Act.	Totals (N = 41) Des.
Preparing required school reports	N. A.																				
	None		1 (33%)						2 (33%)		1 (25%)				2 (20%)		1 (11%)				7 (17%)
	<2		1 (33%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (33%)	3 (50%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)		2 (100%)		4 (40%)	5 (56%)	6 (67%)			13 (32%)	22 (54%)
	2 - 5	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	3 (50%)	1 (17%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)			4 (40%)	3 (30%)	3 (33%)	1 (11%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	17 (41%)	10 (24%)
	>5	1 (33%)						1 (17%)				2 (100%)		6 (60%)	1 (10%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)			11 (27%)	2 (5%)
Preparing school class schedule	N. A.							1 (17%)	1 (17%)					3 (30%)	3 (30%)					4 (10%)	4 (10%)
	None			2 (50%)	2 (50%)			1 (17%)	1 (17%)		1 (25%)		2 (100%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)			6 (15%)	9 (22%)
	<2	2 (67%)	3 (100%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	3 (50%)	4 (67%)	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	2 (100%)		5 (50%)	5 (50%)	8 (89%)	8 (89%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	28 (68%)	28 (68%)
	2 - 5	1 (33%)				1 (50%)														2 (5%)	
	>5							1 (17%)												1 (2%)	
Planning and preparing school budget	N. A.													1 (10%)						1 (2%)	
	None									1 (25%)	1 (25%)				1 (10%)					1 (2%)	2 (5%)
	<2	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	4 (100%)	3 (75%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	4 (67%)	3 (50%)	2 (50%)		1 (50%)	2 (100%)	8 (80%)	6 (60%)	8 (89%)	8 (89%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	32 (78%)	26 (63%)
	2 - 5	1 (33%)	1 (33%)		1 (25%)			1 (17%)	2 (33%)		2 (50%)				3 (30%)					2 (5%)	9 (22%)
	>5		1 (33%)					1 (17%)	1 (17%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)		1 (10%)		1 (11%)	1 (11%)			5 (12%)	4 (10%)
Preparing proposals for funding	N. A.			1 (25%)	1 (25%)			1 (17%)	1 (17%)					1 (10%)				1 (100%)	1 (100%)	4 (10%)	3 (7%)
	None	1 (33%)		1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)			1 (17%)	2 (50%)				2 (20%)	5 (50%)	3 (33%)	1 (11%)			10 (24%)	8 (20%)
	<2	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	4 (67%)	4 (67%)	2 (50%)		1 (50%)	2 (100%)	6 (60%)	4 (40%)	5 (56%)	6 (67%)			21 (51%)	20 (48%)
	2 - 5		2 (67%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)			1 (17%)			3 (75%)			1 (10%)	1 (10%)	1 (11%)	2 (22%)			4 (10%)	9 (22%)
	>5	1 (33%)									1 (25%)	1 (50%)								2 (5%)	1 (2%)

* N.A. = not applicable; <2 = less than 2; >5 = more than five. †Act. = Actual time; Des. = Desired time.

Table B-1 (Cont'd)

Actual and Desired Time Principals Devote to Duties and Responsibilities per Week

Duties/Responsibilities	Time Categories (hours)*	School Level and Location: Senior High — Urban (N = 3) Act.	Urban (N = 3) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Intermediate — Urban (N = 6) Act.	Urban (N = 6) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Elementary — Urban (N = 10) Act.	Urban (N = 10) Des.	Suburban (N = 9) Act.	Suburban (N = 9) Des.	Rural (N = 1) Act.	Rural (N = 1) Des.	Totals (N = 41) Act.	Totals (N = 41) Des.
Evaluating school programs	N. A.																				
	None	1 (33%)																			1 (2%)
	< 2	2 (67%)		1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)		3 (50%)	1 (17%)	2 (50%)				3 (30%)	1 (10%)	4 (44%)	1 (10%)			6 (39%)	4 (10%)
	2 - 5		2 (67%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)		3 (50%)	3 (50%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)			3 (30%)	6 (60%)	3 (33%)	4 (44%)	1 (100%	1 (100%	15 (37%)	20 (49%)
	> 5		1 (33%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)		2 (100%		2 (33%		2 (50%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	4 (40%	3 (30%)	2 (22%)	4 (44%)			9 (22%)	17 (41%)
Developing or revising school policies/procedures	N. A.															1 (11%)	1 (11%)			1 (2%)	1 (2%)
	None	1 (33%)													1 (10%)					1 (2%)	1 (2%)
	< 2	1 (33%)		4 (100%)	4 (100%)	2 (100%	2 (100%	4 (67%)	2 (33%	3 (75%)		2 (100%	2 (100%	7 (70%	7 (70%	8 (89%)	6 (67%)	1 (100%	1 (100%	32 (78%)	24 (59%)
	2 - 5	1 (33%)	3 (100%					2 (33%)	4 (67%)	1 (25%	2 (50%)			3 (30%)	1 (10%		2 (22%			7 (19%)	12 (29%)
	> 5									2 (50%)				1 (10%							3 (7%)
Developing new educational programs and projects	N. A.																				
	None							1 (25%)								1 (11%)	1 (11%)			2 (5%)	1 (2%)
	< 2	2 (67%)		1 (25%	1 (25%	2 (100%	1 (50%	4 (67%	2 (33%	3 (75%	1 (25%	1 (50%	1 (50%	5 (50%	3 (30%	5 (56%	1 (11%	1 (100%	1 (100%	24 (59%	11 (27%
	2 - 5		1 (33%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)		1 (50%)	2 (33%	2 (33%		2 (50%		1 (50%	5 (50%	4 (40%	2 (22%	5 (56%			11 (27%	18 (44%
	> 5	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)				2 (33%		1 (25%	1 (50%			3 (30%	1 (11%	2 (22%			4 (10%)	11 (27%)
Becoming familiar with guidelines for special state or federal programs	N. A.			1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)					1 (100%	1 (10%)	2 (22%)	2 (22%)			6 (15%)	6 (15%)
	None			2 (50%)	2 (50%)		1 (50%)	4 (67%)	4 (67%	3 (75%	3 (75%	1 (50%)	(50%	4 (40%	5 (50%	2 (22%)	2 (22%)	1 (100%	1 (100%	17 (41%)	19 (46%)
	< 2	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)		1 (17%)	1 (17%	1 (25%	1 (25%	1 (50%)		4 (40%	4 (40%	4 (44%	3 (33%			15 (37%)	12 (29%)
	2 - 5	1 (33%)	1 (33%										1 (50%)	1 (10%		1 (11%	2 (22%			3 (7%)	4 (10%)
	> 5																				

* N.A. = not applicable; < 2 = less than 2; > 5 = more than five. †Act. = Actual time; Des. = Desired time.

177

178

Table B-1 (Cont'd)

Actual and Desired Time Principals Devote to Duties and Responsibilities per Week

Duties/Responsibilities	Time Categories (hours)*	School Level and Location: Senior High — Urban (N = 3) Act.	Urban (N = 3) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Intermediate — Urban (N = 6) Act.	Urban (N = 6) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Elementary — Urban (N = 10) Act.	Urban (N = 10) Des.	Suburban (N = 9) Act.	Suburban (N = 9) Des.	Rural (N = 1) Act.	Rural (N = 1) Des.	Totals (N = 41) Act.	Totals (N = 41) Des.
Monitoring special state or federal programs	N. A.			1 (25%)	1 (25%)			1 (17%)	1 (17%)					2 (20%)	2 (20%)	3 (33%)	3 (33%)			7 (17%)	7 (17%)
	None			2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	4 (67%)	5 (83%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)		1 (50%)	3 (30%)	4 (40%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	17 (41%)	19 (46%)
	< 2	2 (67%)	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)			1 (25%)	1 (25%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	2 (22%)	2 (22%)			11 (27%)	10 (24%)
	2 - 5	1 (33%)	1 (33%)					1 (17%)						3 (30%)	2 (20%)		1 (11%)			5 (12%)	4 (10%)
	> 5															1 (11%)	1 (11%)			1 (2%)	1 (2%)
Managing budget for special state or federal programs	N. A.			1 (25%)	1 (25%)			2 (33%)	2 (33%)					2 (20%)	2 (20%)	3 (33%)	3 (33%)			8 (20%)	8 (20%)
	None			3 (75%)	3 (75%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	3 (50%)	4 (67%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	5 (50%)	5 (50%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	20 (49%)	21 (51%)
	< 2	2 (67%)	2 (67%)			1 (50%)	1 (50%)			1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)		3 (30%)	2 (20%)	3 (33%)	3 (33%)			11 (27%)	9 (22%)
	2 - 5	1 (33%)	1 (33%)					1 (17%)							1 (10%)		1 (11%)			2 (5%)	3 (7%)
	> 5																				
Training staff for special state or federal programs	N. A.	1 (33%)		1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (33%)	2 (33%)					2 (20%)	2 (20%)	3 (33%)	3 (33%)			10 (24%)	9 (22%)
	None		2 (67%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	4 (40%)	4 (40%)	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	19 (46%)	21 (51%)
	< 2	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)				1 (17%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)		3 (30%)	3 (30%)	2 (22%)	2 (22%)			10 (24%)	9 (22%)
	2 - 5							1 (17%)						1 (10%)	1 (10%)		1 (11%)			2 (5%)	2 (5%)
	> 5														1 (10%)						1 (2%)
Evaluating special state or federal programs	N. A.			1 (25%)	1 (25%)			2 (33%)	2 (33%)					2 (20%)	2 (20%)	3 (33%)	3 (33%)			8 (20%)	8 (20%)
	None			1 (25%)	1 (25%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	4 (67%)	4 (67%)	3 (75%)	3 (75%)		1 (50%)	3 (30%)	4 (40%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	16 (39%)	17 (41%)
	< 2	3 (100%)	2 (67%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)			1 (25%)	1 (25%)	2 (100%)	1 (50%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	3 (33%)	3 (33%)			15 (37%)	12 (29%)
	2 - 5		1 (33%)											1 (10%)	2 (20%)		1 (11%)			1 (2%)	4 (10%)
	> 5													1 (10%)						1 (2%)	

* N.A. = not applicable; < 2 = less than 2; > 5 = more than five. †Act. = Actual time; Des. = Desired time.

Table B-1 (Cont'd)

Actual and Desired Time Principals Devote to Duties and Responsibilities per Week

Duties/Responsibilities	Time Categories (hours)*	School Level and Location: Senior High — Urban (N = 3) Act.	Urban (N = 3) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Intermediate — Urban (N = 6) Act.	Urban (N = 6) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Elementary — Urban (N = 10) Act.	Urban (N = 10) Des.	Suburban (N = 9) Act.	Suburban (N = 9) Des.	Rural (N = 1) Act.	Rural (N = 1) Des.	Totals (N = 41) Act.	Totals (N = 41) Des.
Managing the school office	N. A.																				
	None							1 (17%)	2 (33%)				1 (50%)							1 (2%)	3 (7%)
	< 2			2 (50%)	1 (25%)		1 (50%)	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)		1 (50%)	1 (10%)	2 (20%)	2 (22%)	5 (56%)			9 (22%)	13 (32%)
	2 - 5	3 (100%)	3 (100%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)		1 (50%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)		1 (25%)	2 (100%)		3 (30%)	3 (30%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)			12 (29%)	11 (27%)
	> 5			1 (25%)	2 (50%)	2 (100%)		1 (17%)	1 (17%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)			6 (60%)	5 (50%)	5 (56%)	3 (33%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	19 (46%)	14 (34%)
Coordinating work with school secretary	N. A.																				
	None					1 (50%)								1 (10%)						2 (5%)	
	< 2	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)			5 (83%)	5 (83%)	4 (100%)	2 (50%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)	2 (20%)	7 (70%)	3 (33%)	5 (56%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	20 (49%)	26 (63%)
	2 - 5	2 (67%)	1 (33%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (100%)	1 (17%)	1 (17%)		2 (50%)			5 (50%)	3 (30%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)			14 (34%)	13 (32%)
	> 5													2 (20%)		3 (33%)	2 (22%)			5 (12%)	7 (17%)
Supervising School cafeteria	N. A.	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)	2 (100%)	2 (100%)					1 (50%)	1 (50%)	2 (20%)	2 (20%)	3 (33%)	3 (33%)			10 (24%)	10 (24%)
	None			1 (25%)	1 (25%)			4 (67%)	4 (67%)	1 (25%)				2 (20%)	3 (30%)		2 (22%)			7 (17%)	11 (27%)
	< 2	2 (67%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)				1 (17%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)			1 (50%)	3 (30%)	4 (40%)	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	11 (27%)	15 (37%)
	2 - 5	1 (33%)						1 (17%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)		1 (50%)				2 (22%)	1 (11%)			7 (17%)	2 (5%)
	> 5	1 (33%)		1 (25%)	1 (25%)			1 (17%)	1 (17%)					3 (30%)	1 (10%)					6 (15%)	3 (7%)
Supervising bus loading	N. A.	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)							3 (30%)	3 (30%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)			8 (20%)	8 (20%)
	None	1 (33%)	1 (33%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)		1 (50%)	3 (50%)	5 (83%)	1 (25%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	4 (40%)	5 (50%)	3 (33%)	5 (50%)			15 (37%)	22 (54%)
	< 2		1 (33%)			1 (50%)		3 (50%)	1 (17%)	3 (75%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (50%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	5 (56%)	3 (33%)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)	15 (37%)	10 (24%)
	2 - 5	1 (33%)																		1 (2%)	
	> 5													2 (20%)	1 (10%)					2 (5%)	1 (2%)

* N.A. = not applicable; < 2 = less than 2; > 5 = more than five. † Act. = Actual time; Des. = Desired time.

Table B-1 (Cont'd)

Actual and Desired Time Principals Devote to Duties and Responsibilities per Week

Duties/Responsibilities	Time Categories (hours)*	School Level and Location: Senior High – Urban (N = 3) Act.	Urban (N = 3) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Intermediate – Urban (N = 6) Act.	Urban (N = 6) Des.	Suburban (N = 4) Act.	Suburban (N = 4) Des.	Rural (N = 2) Act.	Rural (N = 2) Des.	Elementary – Urban (N = 10) Act.	Urban (N = 10) Des.	Suburban (N = 9) Act.	Suburban (N = 9) Des.	Rural (N = 1) Act.	Rural (N = 1) Des.	Totals (N = 41) Act.	Totals (N = 41) Des.
Supervising school yard	N. A.	1 (33%)	1 (33%)			1 (50%)	1 (50%)													2 (5%)	2 (5%)
	None			1 (25%)	1 (25%)		1 (50%)	1 (17%)	2 (33%)		1 (25%)			1 (10%)	2 (20%)		1 (11%)			3 (7%)	8 (20%)
	<2	1 (33%)	2 (67%)	2 (50%)	1 (25%)			1 (17%)	2 (33%)	1 (25%)	1 (25%)		1 (50%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	6 (67%)	6 (67%)			14 (34%)	16 (39%)
	2 - 5			1 (25%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)		3 (50%)	2 (33%)	2 (50%)	2 (50%)	1 (50%)		3 (30%)	2 (20%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	1	1	15 (37%)	11 (27%)
	>5	1 (33%)						1 (17%)		1 (25%)		1 (50%)	1 (50%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)					7 (17%)	4 (10%)
No response														1		1					

* N.A. = not applicable; <2 = less than 2; >5 = more than five. †Act. = Actual time; Des. = Desired time.

Table B-2

School Changes Implemented During the Past Three Years by Principals

Changes Implemented	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
	N=2 (6%)	N=4 (11%)	N=1 (3%)	N=6 (17%)	N=3 (8%)	N=1 (39%)	N=11 (31%)	N=7 (19%)	N=1 (3%)	N=36 (100%)
Student Related										
After School Program				1	1					2
Tutorial Programs				1			3			4
Student Activity Program				1						1
Increased Student Involvement							1			1
Peer Teaching							1			1
Organizational										
Flexible Scheduling	1				1					2
Established K-1 Class							1			1
Double Session Program				1						1
Non-Graded Classroom				1			1			2
Alternate Day Program				1						1
Team Teaching							1	1		2
Multi-Age Grouping-Math								1	1	2
Mini Course Program								1		1

Table B-2 (Cont'd)

School Changes Implemented during the Past Three Years by Principals

Changes Implemented	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Better Communication System							1			1
Instructional Expanded Vocational Education		1								1
Developed Interest Centered Curriculum	1									1
Individualized Instruction		2			2			2		6
Work Experience Program		1								1
Contract Learning		1					1			2
College Credit Courses			1							1
New Math and Eng. Levels				1						1
Math and Reading Labs				1	1		1			3
Career Education				1		1				2
Experimental Science						1				1

Table B-2 (Cont'd)

School Changes Implemented During the Past Three Years

by Principals

Changes Implemented	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Decentralized Budget								1		1
Departmentalization							1			1
Restructure Counseling and Guidance Program	1									1
Grading Practices						1				1
Reduced No. Of Class Periods					1					1
Open Supply Storeroom System							1			1
Community/ Parents Involvement in School Program		1			1					2
Parent Education							1			1
Volunteer Speakers							1			1
Parent Sponsored Student Study Trips							1			1

Table B-2 (Cont'd)

School Changes Implemented During the Past Three Years by Principals

Changes Implemented	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Learning Center						1	2			3
Co-ed P.E.				1						1
Algebra-Computer Program				1						1
Social Studies Lab				1						1
Media Center							1			1
Multiethnic Programs							3	1		4
Outdoor Education							1			1
Developmental P.E.								1		1
Developed Scope and Sequences for Basic Skills								1		1
Review System for Students with Special Needs								1		1
Alternative Programs	1	1					2			4

Table B-2(Cont'd)

School Changes Implemented During the Past Three Years

by Principals

Changes Implemented	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Staff Increased Staff Stability and Morale		1						2		3
Staff Development Program				2						2
Total	4	8	1	14	7	4	25	12	1	76
No Response	1		1		1	1		3		7

Table B-3

Help Received from Pre- and Inservice Training for Implementing School Change

Help Received	School Level and Location									Total
	Senior High			Intermediate			Elementary			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
	N=2 (6%)	N=2 (6%)	N=1 (3%)	N=5 (16%)	N=3 (9%)	N=1 (3%)	N=11 (34%)	N=6 (19%)	N=1 (3%)	N=32 (100%)
Inservice Helped to Recognize Possibilities of Innovations				1	1		3	2		7 (22%)
Helped with Planning but not Implementation	1			1			2			4 (13%)
Pre & Inservice Insignificant or no Help	1	2	1	3	2	1	6	4	1	21 (66%)
No Response	1	2	1	1	1	1		4		11

Table B-4

Distribution of Pre-service Preparation Course Usefulness by School Level and Location

Senior High

Pre Service Course	Urban (N=3)					Suburban (N=4)					Rural (N=2)				
	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful	Was not offered	Did not Take	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful	Was not Offered	Did not Take	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful	Was not Offered	Did not Take
General School Administration	2	1				1	1	2			2				
Curriculum Development		2					3	1				1	1		
School Finance / Economics		3				1	3					2			
School Personnel Management		3					3	1				1	1		
School Organization		3					3	1				1	1		
Education and the Law	1	1	1			2	2					2			
Internship/ Field Experience				3		2			2			1		1	
Teacher Negotiations				3			1		3					2	
Supervision / Evaluation		2		1			4						2		
Politics of Education															
Creativity Techniques															
Behavioral Objectives															
Liberal Arts Background															

Table B-4 (Cont'd)

Distribution of Pre-service Preparation Course Usefulness by School Level and Location

Intermediate

Pre Service Course	Urban (N=6)					Suburban (N=4)					Rural (N=1)				
	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful	Was not offered	Did not Take	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful	Was not Offered	Did not Take	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful	Was not Offered	Did not Take
General School Administration		5	1				4					1			
Curriculum Development	1	2	3			1	3					1			
School Finance /Economics	2	3	1				2	2				1			
School Personnel Management	1	2	1	1	1		3		1					1	
School Organization	2	1	3				4				1				
Education and the Law	1	3		1	1	1	3				1				
Internship/ Field Experience	1	1	1	2	1	4					1				
Teacher Negotiations		1		3	2		1	1	1	1		1			
Supervision / Evaluation		4	1	1		1	2		1			1			
Politics of Education	1														
Creativity Techniques						1									
Behavioral Objectives						1									
Liberal Arts Background															

Table B-4 (Cont'd)

Distribution of Pre-service Preparation Course Usefulness by School Level and Location

Elementary

Pre Service Course	Urban (N=11)					Suburban (N=9)					Rural (N=1)				
	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful	Was not Offered	Did not Take	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful	Was not Offered	Did not Take	Very Useful	Somewhat Useful	Not Useful	Was not Offered	Did not Take
General School Administration	2	7	2			1	7	1				1			
Curriculum Development	2	4	5			1	7	1				1			
School Finance / Economics	3	6	1			2	5	2				1			
School Personnel Management	2	5	4			1	4		2	2		1			
School Organization	2	5	5				7	1		1		1			
Education and the Law	3	5	2		1	2	5	2				1			
Internship / Field Experience	6	2			3	2	2	1	2	2				1	
Teacher Negotiations		5	1	1	4		2	1	4	2				1	
Supervision / Evaluation	2	5	4				8		1			1			
Politics of Education															
Creativity Techniques															
Behavioral Objectives															
Liberal Arts Background	1														
No Response						1									

Table B-5

Distribution of Type and Usefulness of Inservice Programs

Sponsoring Agency and Type Inservice Program	School Level and Location																							
	Senior High									Intermediate								Elementary						
	Urban			Sub.			Rural			Urban			Sub.			Rural			Urban			Sub.			Rural		
	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful
School District Administrative Practices	1										1		1						3			5					
Behavioral Modification																			1								
Behavioral Objectives										1				1													
Conflict Resolution																			1			1					
Finance													1														
Goal Setting																						1					
Human Relations		1																									
Individualized Instruction										1																	
Innovations														1					1								
Management by Objectives													1														
Managing Fed. and State Programs																			1								
Multicultural Education																											
Problem Solving																											
Program Development																			1								
Program Planning																											
Teacher Evaluation																				1			1				
Vocational Education	1																										

Table B5 (Cont)

Distribution of Type and Usefulness of Inservice Programs

Sponsoring Agency and Type Inservice Program	School Level and Location																											
	Senior High									Intermediate									Elementary									
	Urban			Sub.			Rural			Urban			Sub.			Rural			Urban			Sub.			Rural		
	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful	Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not useful
ACSA																												
Innovations										1				1		1				3			3					
Junior High/Middle Road																	1											
Leadership, Management											1									1		2						
Parent Education																			1									
School Budgeting				1																								
Supervision																1					1							
Teacher Evaluation				1																								
Westinghouse Learning Corporation																												
Individualized Instruction																						1						
National Training Laboratory																												
Organizational Development																			3									
Calif. State Dept. of Education																												
Multicultural Education																				1								
Vocational Education				1																								
Colleges/Universities																												
Admin. Extern										1																		
Affective Education																			1									
Schools Without Failure																												
No Response			1			4			1			1			2			1			2			3			1	